G/20

Entered
30.9.55

Provincial Museum
LUCKNOW.

Calcutta University Readership Lectures

INDIANISM AND ITS EXPANSION

BY

F. W. THOMAS, M.A., PH.D.

UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA
1942

G
20

STATE MUSEUM, LUCKNOW
LIBRARY

Acc. No.

Book No.

9019

INDIANISM AND ITS EXPANSION

934

G/20

Provincial Museum, LUCKNOW.

Calcutta University Readership Lectures

INDIANISM AND ITS EXPANSION

BY

F. W. THOMAS, M.A., Ph.D.

UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA
1942

PRINTED IN INDIA

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY BHUPENDRALAL BANERJEE AT THE CALCUTTA
UNIVERSITY PRESS, 48, HAZRA ROAD, BALLYGUNGE, CALCUTTA

1208B—December, 1942—B.

CONTENTS

SUBJECT	PAGE
PREFATORY NOTE	vii
I : Generalities	1
II : The Vedic, or Aryan, Period	11
III : The Period of Maturity and Organization ...	23
IV : The Vedānta Period	40
V : Greater India : 1. Central Asia	55
VI : Greater India : 2. Tibet	71
VII : Greater India : 3. China	86
VIII : Greater India : 4. Further India and Malaysia ...	97

934

PREFATORY NOTE

The following pages embody a course of lectures on Indian culture and its influence abroad, delivered early in 1938 by Dr. F. W. Thomas of Oxford as a Reader of the Calcutta University. Owing unfortunately to recent developments in the international situation, the author had hardly any opportunity of correcting the proofs as thoroughly as he would have done under normal circumstances. A certain amount of work had to be done on the spot, and I had to undertake it at the request of the authorities responsible for the publication of the lectures. Needless to say that the *anukalpa* is only an illustration of the well-known adage *madhv-abhāve guḍam.* The undersigned craves the indulgence of readers for errors that might have crept into the text.

Department of Ancient
Indian History and Culture,
Calcutta University.
The 25th August, 1942.

Dines Chandra Sircar

INDIANISM AND ITS EXPANSION

I: GENERALITIES

It will not be expected, I think, by those of you who are acquainted with the circumstances in which these lectures have been prepared, that they will bear a character of novelty and serious research. Many of you have personal experience of the long labour and concentration which in the domain of Indology, after the labours of generations of able scholars, is requisite for the establishment of even a single new fact. And the extended area embraced by the title of the lectures will have warned you that what they envisage is a general survey. Should any original points emerge, that would be all to the good. But in any case it is sometimes not unprofitable to review broadly what one has studied in detail. Many scholars who have toiled laboriously through, let us say, the text of the *Ṛg-Veda* or *Mahā-Bhārata*, might nevertheless obtain new lights from a tranquil perusal of some translation. General conceptions, if they are true, are not less true than particular observations; and they have this advantage, that they tend to illuminate the particulars and help to order them in the memory. I hope at least that we may find some satisfaction in contemplating succinctly as a whole the wide developments of Sanskrit literature. In this first lecture we shall be occupied only with generalities.

It is a familiar fact that the history of India, like that of China, has been indented by conquest from without. Under Cyrus and Darius the Achaemenid kingdom seems to have been master of a part of the Punjab, as well as of all the countries west of the Indus. As a successor of the Persians, Alexander made his invasion in the year 326 B.C., and for a few years his successors governed or controlled most of the Punjab and the Indus provinces as far as Sind. In the early part of the second century B.C. the Bactrian Greeks commenced invasions, culminating in the kingdom of Menander, who about the middle of that century ruled from his capital Sāgala perhaps as far east as Mathurā. Without an interval the Greeks were succeeded by the Śakas, Pahlavas, and Kuṣāṇas, of whom the first-named remained masters of Mālwā and Western India until about 390 A.D., while the last were probably replaced in the Punjab during part of the third and fourth centuries A.D. by the Persian Sassanians. Towards the end of the fifth century the empire of the Guptas lost to the Hūṇas for a period of about 50 years the more western portions of Hindustān; and for a longer period Kashmir and the Himālayan provinces to its east were, under Hūṇa rulers, a menace to Hindu kingdoms. Early in the eighth century the Musalmans took possession of the province of Sind, and they came into conflict with the Calukya and Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdoms of Gujarāt. In 1000 A.D. commenced the invasions of the Indus countries by the Turks of Ghazni; and this was the first stage of an Islamic conquest which did not come to a pause without overthrowing the most easterly Hindu kingdom, that of the Bengal Senas (*c.* 1199 A.D.), and the last powerful southern kingdom, that of Vijayanagar (1565 A.D.). The Portuguese, Dutch, English and French may be said, if we neglect the Marāṭhas and Sikhs, to have contended in the main not with a Hindu, but with a Muhammadan, India.

In regard to the earlier conquests we are apt to overlook the fact that generally the greater part of what we call India was beyond their range and the south, in particular, was untouched by them. This applies to all the predecessors of the Musalmans, except that the dominions of the Śakas embraced during a considerable period some portion of the Deccan; and in the case of the Musalmans, even, it applies to all the predecessors of 'Alā-ud-Dīn. Outside the actual dominions of these foreigners the continuity of Hindu culture may have been little affected by their presence in India. But there is also another factor which renders it intelligible that the foreign conquests should not have made epochs in Indian history. That is the impenetrability and reactiveness of the Indian culture itself. Far from importing serious modification into Indian life, we see the foreigners manifesting phenomena of Indianization. The Greek Menander is described as interesting himself in Buddhist philosophy; and about 100 B.C. a person of Greek name dedicates a pillar in honour of Vāsudeva as a follower of the Bhāgavata religion. The Śakas and Kuṣāṇas adopt Indian titles, inaugurate Buddhist foundations and in other ways show the influence of their surroundings. The Musalmans during their long domination do not fail to affect the administrative system and the art history and they even evoke new religious movements. In one way or another they effect extensive conversions. In all but minor matters they are protected from modification of their own religious and social systems by their solidarity with the world of Islam outside. But the decay of the Musalman supremacy finds the Hindu views of life and religion and their social system practically unmodified; and the spirit of the Rājput kingdoms and the administrative system of the Marāṭhas are practically what they would have been if the Musalman domination had never taken place. How different is the situation of Persia!

The rather parallel case of China suggests that the mere magnitude of the two great countries may have been the controlling circumstance. The great populousness of India has been attested from early times: it impressed the Greeks and is evident from the details which they give of the several kingdoms. The mass may have been too great to be noticeably moved by the relatively slender forces which were brought to bear upon it. It might further be suggested that the invaders, though their initial impetus and the incurable dissension of the Indian states may have sufficed for a first conquest, were for the most part without a reserve in their rear from which they might have derived continuous reinforcement. This was obviously the case with the Greeks and Śakas and Pahlavas, whose base was cut away by the supervention of the Kuṣāṇas ; and perhaps the longer persistence of Śaka rule in western India may have been due in the main to the proximity of a source of supply in the Śaka realm of Seistan. It may be pointed out, further, that the relative success and duration of Musalman rule was conditioned, no doubt, by the circumstance that the Afghans, Turks, Mughals who succeeded each other had this much in common that, despite their racial differences, they were successive waves of Islam. Even in the case of the Aryans, the first historical invaders of India, where probably they encountered a civilization more advanced than their own, we may plausibly suppose that during a long period they received constant reinforcement from Aryan tribes inhabiting the trans-Indus countries.

To a certain extent it seems undeniable that these foreign invasions do constitute periods in the history of India. It cannot but make a serious difference to the psychology and development of any people, if the supreme authority is wielded by rulers who do not participate in its general outlook and are not intimately affected by its sentiments. In such cases, men of ability may nevertheless come to the front and hold positions of prominence and authority in the State ; but they can do so only by an attitude of accommodation, accepting hypothetically the guiding principles of the ruling power and repressing their own instinctive tendencies and reactions. This may be a good thing for many, or most, of us ; and we may remark that it occurs not only in case of conquest, but also in case of any extensive penetration, such as it is rather widely evidenced in the world. We can all sympathize with the Roman poet of the time when his city was paying the penalty of empire by becoming more cosmopolitan than national and when he saw that his status as a true-born Roman, nurtured in good old fashioned ways in the city of the Seven Hills, went for nothing in a society where the clever foreigner and foreign ideas had too strong an influence. 'I cannot endure,' he exclaims, 'a Greek Rome' ; and this sentiment was expressed in the very age when on the fringe of the empire the Hebrew Christian St. Paul successfully appealed from the jurisdiction of a local tribunal on the ground of being a statutory Roman citizen. To a certain extent a similar feeling may occur without any foreign penetration at all, when in changing times the older people see their ways of life, their philosophy, their outlook make no longer any appeal to a new generation. But foreign domination not only depresses the old, but also baffles and discourages the young. Only if the new generations derive a substantial benefit from the changed conditions and feel themselves uplifted and emancipated from the old can the natural sense of depression be lost in a new optimism.

It may be doubted whether in the past the Hindus ever had the feeling of any superiority in foreign invaders or conquerors beyond that of possibly temporary material power. And we may even doubt whether in cases where movements from within attained to popularity and prominence the convictions of the orthodox, as distinguished from their influence, sustained a shock. Fixity of conviction and persistence of the old in a changed milieu are indeed no monopoly of India : ask yourselves, for instance, how far the Roman Catholic Church is prepared to recognize any progress in truth or method in the Protestant communities which broke away from it. But India has witnessed such phenomena as the extinction of Buddhism after more than a thousand years of prominent activity ; and it can still count among its devout persons, though in singularly reduced numbers, as compared with even a century ago, those who with minute exactness carry out rituals which have had no non-professional appeal since the Vedic age.

In recent times it has often been pointed out that Hinduism has shown a remarkable power of absorbing originally alien elements and that this has applied not only to less civilized peoples within its range and to unorthodox enclaves formed in its own body, but also to influences from outside. Keshub Chunder Sen was perhaps the first to greet with enthusiasm from a Hindu point of view the familiarizing of India with Christian religious sentiments and with the person of Christ; but he was not the last to contemplate such a development as an incorporation of Christianity into the wider scope of Hinduism.

In these circumstances, and considering the quick absorption of most of the conquerors, as well as the limited range of their conquests, it seems reasonable to question whether any distinctions of periods based upon them have significance, except as a framework for political history and chronology. Possibly they may connote hardly any effect upon the social life or general mentality; and we are inclined to ask whether essentially there are any periods at all. It has sometimes been suggested that in the early Vedic age the constitution of society may have been already not so very different from what it was in the time of Buddha; and we know with what plausibility a Śiva-like figure, adoration of the ox and *yoga*-practice, have been recognised in the trouvailles of the excavations at Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa.

There is indeed one distinction of periods which from very early times has been recognized in India, namely that between the present Kali age and earlier, more virtuous, times; and in literature the distinction coincides more or less with that drawn between the *Śruti*, or revelation, literature and the *Smṛti*, or literature of human authorship, and approximately, again, with the distinction adopted by European writers between the Vedic and post-Vedic, or Sanskrit, literature. That in the Vedic mentality itself and in its literature there are well-marked stages is obvious; and clear views in regard to it have prevailed since the lines were first laid down in Max Müller's fundamental work on Sanskrit literature. It is, of course, equally obvious that in the development of particular disciplines, for instance, philosophy and logic, literary theory, law, mathematics and astronomy, medicine and so forth, literary styles and *genres*, definite stages of progress can be made out; but can we so adjust any of these as to elicit any general changes of outlook which can be brought into connection with chronology?

It may, perhaps, at the risk of saying nothing new and at the same time indulging in an empty schematism, be suggested that there are really three main periods in the history of Indian mentality, namely—

1. The Vedic, or Āryan, period, which witnessed the creation of the Indian man.
2. The period of maturity and organization.
3. The post-Śaṃkara or Vedānta period.

In the first of these the Āryan was, no doubt, absorbing influences from his milieu : in the second he stood firm in his general outlook on life, but might, had he encountered outside his sphere any conceptions transcending his own, have been amenable to them, while within his system he was engaged in a multifarious discussion of conflicting views : in the third he may be said to have become absolutely impervious to intellectual influence from outside in the possession of an all-absorbing, all-embracing, all-denying philosophy which satisfied him completely.

A question may however be raised as to the value of any such classifications. 'Why,' it may be asked, 'not content ourselves with the hard-won facts of historical and literary chronology ? What is the advantage of constructing an imaginary Indian mentality with a development of its own ? Is it not better to recognise that India is a land of many races, and even peoples of widely different grades of culture, imperfectly amalgamated into a loose general framework which defies definition ? An attempt to draw lines of contemporaneity across their vertical lines of development ignores the chronological differences in their starting points : moreover, even for the single lines of development the conception of periods does violence to the continuity of history, which is incompatible with any sharp divisions. A people Hinduized in, say, the sixth century A. D. was bound to develop differently from one which had participated in the prior evolution of Hinduism itself.'

These objections, however, imply a denial of conceptions which in practice are universally assumed. In regard to the individual man no one doubts that he has some governing intellectual ethical ideas and propensities, which, apart from extraneous distractions and compulsions, characterize his behaviour as a whole. Groups and institutions are controlled by the logic of their constitution; and, when we speak of the larger and more fundamental and permanent groupings, such as nationalities and religions, we credit them unhesitatingly with a 'spirit' at work in their temporal transformations. As regards the differences in the point of commencement, the outstanding fact seems to be the rapidity and completeness with which a system is adopted by the latest adherents, and how frequently it is just among such that forcible new developments are initiated. Alexander the great, conscious propagator of Hellenism, was ruler of the recently Hellenized Macedonians. Buddha and Mahāvīra arose in the eastern and perhaps not completely Brāhmanized province of Āryan India; and perhaps it is not an accident that Śaṃkara himself was born in the extreme south. It seems quite intelligible that the lively conviction of relatively new adherents should be sensitive to difficulties and open to new lights.

Since all intellectual propositions are *vikalpas* and provoke their negations, the existence of a scheme is likely to be accompanied by manifestations of exactly opposite tendency. The present time, with its antithesis of communism and nationalism, is an instance which will be present in the mind of every one. It may not be so that the assertion calls into existence a previously non-existent opposite: a latent and only instinctive negation may be kindled into activity by the explicitness of its positive. In the periods of Indian history, if we can effectively bring to light the operation of intellectual schemata, we should expect to find evidence of the influence of their contradictories.

It is likely to be admitted that Indian man,—and this applies over the whole area and to all classes,—is a being addicted from early times to thought or reflection, which is not necessarily the same as free thought. How thoroughly this has been characteristic of even the rustic population is shown by the masses of proverbial wisdom and of minute discriminations and the acute observation and comment exhibited in popular literature, and particularly in the literature of animal fable: perhaps also by the litigiousness which is charged against the people. Hence it is not legitimate to assume that there has been a dumb acquiescence in events coming in any measure within their ken. It may be assumed that they have always found some one to praise or blame for what happened to them and have not always accused their own *karma*. The history of India has been in fact a history of incessant discussion and debate; and positive pronouncements and proceedings, which appear with marked suddenness, have behind them, in general, considerable periods of dialectical incubation.

I trust that I do not appear to be taking a line of opposition to the view adumbrated in the phrase 'the positive background of Hindu sociology.' No one could fail to realize the ever-increasing complication in the organization of Āryan society, occasioned by the constantly widened area in which that society was recognized. Even in Manu the diversity of castes and occupations is already great; and with their later multiplication and the progress of differentiation in the arts and crafts the practical complexity became too great for any systematic description. No one could question that in law, commercial life and practical arts many an item of improvement or convenience will have been due to individual invention or to adoption from outside, particularly perhaps from the arts of the Greeks. No one would contend that the *Artha-śāstra* does not include elements derived from practical experience of the work of government. Such factors, though they constitute a welter of historical accidents, must in a realistic history of Indian, as *mutatis mutandis* of any other, sociology, be considered, along with extraneous matters such as famines, earthquakes, and contacts with independent foreign developments.

But it would not be reasonable to assume that these things occur without being adjusted to the preconceptions of the people themselves. Was not the conception of *sva-dharma* in itself an attempt to bring under one formula the whole mass of divergent usages and occupations? The very classification of human purposes under the scheme of *dharma*, *artha*, *kāma* and *mokṣa* is an attempt to frame a complete theory of life. Was there ever in India a theory of the state, except perhaps that of the Buddhists, which did not rest upon an ethical or philosophical base? If a scientific account, apart from a mere narrative, of Indian social evolution should ever be possible, it will not be upon the assumption that the people confronted each factor, as it emerged, with helpless passivity, innocent of all prejudice or prepossession as to how things ought to be. In regard to matters of state and the conduct of rulers no people has ever been so drenched with instruction, no rulers so overwhelmed with authoritative admonition, as the Indian: seeing that the *Mahā-Bhārata*, wherein the fundamentals and superstructure of these matters are discussed with unwearying reiteration, has been until recent times the literary daily bread of both sexes, learned and unlearned. The arts too, such as music, architecture and sculpture, have always gone hand in hand with religion; and the *Sarasvatī-pūjā* reminds us that the same was the case with every craft.

Really, however, we might, but for a possible misunderstanding, have dispensed with this digression. For our subject is not periods of Indian history or sociology, but periods in literary development or mentality; in which sphere an inner, logical or psychological, process would perhaps not be denied.

II: THE VEDIC, OR ARYAN, PERIOD

The civilization of the earliest Indo-Āryans can hardly be said to have had a beginning. The tribes which in the *Ṛg-Veda* we find making progress in the overrunning of north-western India, whether they were, as seems likely, an overflow from settlements in the districts west of the Indus or were in the course of a long migration, brought with them an established system of life. There can be no doubt that horses and cattle were prominent factors in their economy, that is, they were car-riders and ranchers. They migrated with war-chariot and wain, and, no doubt, with cattle. In their fights they had both car-borne leaders and footmen. They had clan divisions within the tribes. Some of these clans were specialists in religious ritual and worship, which were already rather elaborate. There were rituals for domestic ceremonies, both regular, as in the daily worship of the household fire, and occasional, for instance, on occasions of weddings and funerals, probably also on the birth of children; but there would, moreover, be some public gatherings in the houses of chiefs, and probably very special ones on occasion of investitures, battles and expeditions and victories, and also seasonal rites. A rather pedantic elaboration appears already in the classification of priestly functions; and, likely enough, the language of the hymns and liturgies was archaic or hieratic from the first. At any rate, there is no doubt that the composers were conscious of their craftsmanship and adjusted the tone of their compositions to the spirit of the occasion and the associations of the deities invoked. The divine powers also were numerous and various, assembled from very divergent ages and sources: in general they were of vague personality and not represented by images; nor were there permanent shrines of any kind.

It seems that the tribes could not, like the Turks and Mongols in Transoxiana, live nomadically among settled populations, demanding only domination and tribute. They were raiders and appropriators, and their attitude to any town populations which they encountered was aggressive, so that their chief war-god was acclaimed as *pūrbhid*, 'breaker of strongholds.' But, as they progressed eastward—for probably the lower Indus country had no attraction for them or presented obstacles—leaving behind an increasing Āryan domain, it was inevitable that larger concentrations should be formed. Probably the first extensive kingdom arose in the Delhi region, where, in fact, the progress may have made a temporary halt. The obstacle would have been the great forest filling the valley of the Jumna and Ganges rivers. Progress in that region, sparsely peopled by forest tribes, the *Āṭavikas* of the later political literature, would probably take place partly by way of the great rivers and partly by forest settlements along the line of the foothills of the northern mountain barrier: and the latter might also be reinforced by an equally natural up-river movement. In regard to the forest settlements we may find analogies not only in the subsequent organization of southern India, which is the theme of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, but also in such modern developments as the backwoods settlements which constituted the early progress of the Europeans in America and in the present day penetration of the hill tracts of Travancore.

Rivers and forests have played a great part in Indian religion and literature, and each of them might furnish a subject for imaginative monographs of deep fascination. It seems not fanciful to conceive that, whereas the sanctity of rivers may have secured its hold upon Indo-Aryan mentality during the advance through the Punjab and the countries west of the Indus, the forest, which however, has been less enduring than the rivers, made its impression during the period of advance down the Ganges valley. The habit of backwoods dwelling may not have been initiated by the Brāhmans, who will simply have accompanied the advances of adventurous princes or other leaders, due to more mundane causes; but they may well have maintained such a way of life long after the settlements had developed into townships and cities. *Āraṇyakas* and *Upaniṣads*, which were 'private, professional *niṣads*,' may have first taken shape in such a period.

Evidently the compilation of the *Ṛg-Veda* cannot go back beyond the period of settled kingdoms. The familiar facts of its arrangement show that it is based upon prior collections, belonging to separate families of priests. These collections were oral, not written, and must have been made for business purposes, *i.e.*, for use on recurrent occasions. But there was nothing to prevent the inclusion of poems composed originally for some single ceremony or under some mere inspiration, which had established themselves in memory or in favour. The conjoint collection must have been likewise only oral; and so the nature of the whole transaction was simply that the different groups of priests received authorization to learn and use the collections of other groups. Under what compulsion this unification was accomplished is a subject for speculation. Was it that developments in ritual enforced the combined use of compositions from more than one group? Was it that a growing solidarity of the Brāhmanic interest, a meeting of Rishis in the Naimiṣa forest, cast rivalries into the shade? Or was it at the bidding of some powerful prince or other great personality, some early Candragupta, Aśoka or Kaniṣka, that amalgamation was accepted? Once constituted, the text must have had a complex history. We have it in a *Saṃhitā* or Sandhi form, perhaps centuries later than the dates at which it was constituted; and its oldest commentary, the *Pada*-text, which rebuilds this form on the basis of general grammar, must itself have undergone progressive modification to keep pace with the current pronunciation of the grammatical forms. The compilation of the *Sāma-Veda* was, no doubt, a later corollary of that of the *Ṛk-Veda*.

In principle the ritual will have been earlier than the hymns; and possibly the composition of hymns was at first a subordinate function of the operant priest. The *Brāhmaṇa* literature, which envisages the rituals themselves and comments on the hymns and sacrificial utterances only as they occur in that connection, deals with the actual procedures in the rites and with their significances. The *Brāhmaṇas* are, so to say, the *śilpa-śāstras* of the priests, reflective treatises in prose, which presuppose the consolidation of the priestly order for whose instruction they were composed. Their great importance for us is as a matrix containing the germs of all the later Brāhmanical sciences, exegesis, grammar, phonetics, logic, etymology, metre, astronomy, cosmology; as exhibiting the transition from the early conceptions of limited divinities to that of a god in the monotheistic sense and the germ of the conception of the twice-born man. By the elaborate treatment which they give of certain great public ceremonies connected with royalty, the coronation ceremonies, *rājasūya, abhiṣeka, abhiṣecanīya, vājapeya, aśvamedha*, they attest the growth of considerable states: and in details they furnish indication of the organization thereof and of the powers and duties of sovereignty. Though they give illustrative stories from life, as well as myths and ancient legends, they do not furnish any direct attestation of the existence of secular literature.

As regards their main purpose, the *Brāhmaṇas*, by their addiction to symbolisms, evidently conceived as naturalistic relations, affirm a mode of thought which has been called magical, but which would, if the reality of their subject-matter were conceded, be rather termed mechanist; this mode of conceiving the operation of the numinous power, which tended to reduce the divinities to the status of links in a causal chain, is worked out with methodical conviction which shrinks from no absurdities. This view, which was destined later to be signally set aside, has nevertheless a permanent place in Indian mentality, since it reappears in the *Mīmāṃsā* philosophy and in the doctrine of *karma*; even in the later logic an item of mechanist psychology is incorporated in the theory of the syllogism.

Since we are not describing historically, but only characterizing for a particular purpose, the developments of Vedic literature, we need not dwell upon the history of the Brāhmanical sciences. As regards grammatical matters, the phonetical observation and classification, so exact and scientific, the etymological analysis (as shown in the mature work of Pāṇini, in contrast to the tendencious or popular caprices of the Yāska exegetics), and the acute and just definitions of the import of forms and syntactical usage, are not more admirable than the sound general views of the psychology and philosophy of language, so far as they go. When we read the introduction to the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali, we cannot but feel that here is one whose grasp of the function of language is sure. But there does remain one observation which may not be inapposite here. A considerable part of the matters in debate between Patañjali and his captious predecessor, relates not to the facts of the case, but to the manner in which they are marshalled in the Pāṇinean *sūtras*. Thus the grammatical *śāstra*, the first of the formal *śāstras*, comes to us involved in methodological discussions; and we see here, what indeed we may trace elsewhere, that matters of style and literary method were, at the end of the Vedic period, already on the level of critical reflection. At the end of the *Artha-śāstra* of Kauṭalya there is a chapter, entitled *Tantra-yukti*, which furnishes definitions and examples of a large number of terms, *adhikaraṇa*, *vidhāna*, *yoga*, *padārtha*, *hetu*, etc., relating to matters of literary exposition and logic, forms and functions of statement and so forth. And in the *Mahā-Bhārata* (Śānti-parvan, cccxxii, verses 11, 930, etc.), we have the discourse of Sulabha, who, after beginning—

'O king, speech should be free from the faults, nine and nine, impairing expression and sense, of adequate meaning, and furnished with eighteen excellences'.

proceeds to dilate on comprehensiveness, *saṃkhyā*, *krama*, *prayojana*, and adds (vv. 11,938-41)—

'These, O King, comprehensiveness and the rest as described, inherent in one meaning, a sentence, hear from me. What I shall say will be of adequate meaning, of sense not piecemeal, accordant to logic, not redundant, not loose and not confused, therefore perfect, not in turgid syllables, nor indifferent to agreeableness, not false, nor at variance with the triad, nor again unpolished; not defective or harsh-sounding, nor again spoilt by wrong order; not elliptical reconsideration, precluding lack of cause and reason.'

It seems clear that both these passages are on the same level as the *paribhāṣā* practice in the Pāṇinean system and also as the method of the Pāli *Abhidhamma* (*Dhamma-saṅgaṇi*) and the enumeration of *lakṣaṇas* in the earliest stage of the *Alaṃkāra-śāstra*.

In regard to the special philosophy of the *Brāhmaṇas*, culminating in the great sayings *tat tvam asi* and *aham brahmāsmi*, what we would select for comment is the fact that the old *Upaniṣads*, those unspeakably touching records of the earnest communings, are really the 'most private' professional conferences of colleagues, teachers and pupils. In their form they are for the most part given as compilations of discussions and lessons by various persons on diverse occasions. They differ from the Buddhist *sūtras*, the dialogues of Plato and the Christian gospels in this particular that generally there is no one central figure dominating the scene, and from the former also in another respect, namely that the discussions are not professedly concentrated upon a single matter. Their subject-matter is simply the *arcana* of the priestly reflection as a whole. Essentially the same form recurs in the discussions contained in the *Śānti-parvan* and *Anuśāsana-parvan* of the *Mahā-Bhārata*, and extensively in the *Purāṇas*. The form has this value, that it avoids an appearance of egotism on the part of the author and perhaps relieves him of responsibility, that it invests the doctrines with a semblance of extraneous authority, and that it has the charm of a story. These features will not, however, obscure the fact, which appears also from other evidence, that public or semi-public discussions and debates upon such topics were among the actual signs of the times and were in favour sometimes at the courts of princes ; and this brings us to the matter of the non-priestly literature.

In the early texts of the *Veda* there seems to be no reference to compositions by non-priestly authors. But there is mention of speeches in the public assemblies ; and it is in the nature of things that both in such assemblies and in festival gatherings at the houses of chiefs there would be from time to time occasion for verse recitations, as well as for music. But there is no evidence that the need for these could be supplied by any class of persons other than the priestly families. A transition stage is perhaps indicated in the statement that the *Sūtas*, or court bards, were offspring of Brāhman fathers by Kṣatriya mothers. But, when we come to the *Upaniṣads*, with their stories of royal and other persons, and even women, taking an interest and a part in religious and philosophical discussions, it is evident that already we are in a period of lay culture. It is likely therefore that there was already an amount of lay authorship, and, in particular, that the classes of court poets and minstrels, who celebrated the histories and feats of kings, their battles, genealogies and so forth, were already in existence ; and this conclusion is, it is well known, confirmed by the mention of the *Bhārata* among the forms of composition cited in the *Āśvalāyana gṛhya-sūtra* and elsewhere. In such lay literature we must include a number of systematic treatises designed for education or instruction ; not indeed the sciences taught in the Brāhman schools, not perhaps medicine, which grew up probably in connection with the *Atharva-Veda*, not the treatise on *dharma*, sacred law and custom, which branched forth, no doubt, from the exposition of *Gṛhya* rituals, but surely such studies as the *Dhanur-veda*, 'the Veda of the Bow,' which was the science of the Kṣatriyas, and surely the science of government, royal policy, and any treatise that there may have been on subjects of an economic character, *vārttā*. Among these the most important by far is the science of Government, which in the time of the *Artha-śāstra* of Kauṭalya, the *Manu-smṛti* and the *Mahā-Bhārata* had evidently had a long history. In the *Artha-śāstra* and the *Mahā-Bhārata* a succession of divergent theories is cited ; and from the citations in the former it is evident that the discussions were detailed, including not only differences on wide principles, but also matters of administration, treated in part scholastically, as happens in the case of other early works.

Lastly, we must refer to that literature, which was not merely lay, but also anti-Brāhmanic or heretical. I need not point out that the two great heretic religions, Jainism and Buddhism, agree in denying the authority of the Brāhmans and therewith that of the Brāhmanic scriptures, the *Vedas*. Their criticisms extended even to Brāhmanically sanctioned usages in daily life. In a well known passage of the *Edicts*,—and also in the *Tripiṭaka* there is much to the same effect,—Aśoka notes with disapproval the practice of many useless observances, *maṅgalas*, in connection with marriages, births, and so forth, and proposes to substitute entertainments of a more edifying character. The Lokāyata or Cārvāka doctrine went further, since in its materialism it decried not only the value and reasonableness of Brāhmanic rites, but also all ethical, and even moral ideas and the very existence of a soul.

In the tumult of sophistico-philosophic dialectics which in the time of Buddha pervaded the Indo-Āryan world it is not self-evident that every thing that was new was unorthodox. One of the matters most debated was whether there was such a thing as *kriyā*, or action, and accordingly, of moral responsibility. No philosophical doctrine of *karma* had yet been incorporated into the Brāhmanical system. In its practical implications, indeed, the doctrine of non-action was destructive of the whole system of Brāhmanism as a scheme of ritual actions qualifying the performer for a future benefit. But the mechanist nature of the conception left it still open to maintain that, while the action and the reward might be admitted, there was nevertheless in the agent a deep spiritual essence which had no part or lot in either. This was the principle of the Sāṃkhya philosophy, which, far from being unorthodox, was, in one form or another, the dominant, almost the sole, philosophy of the later Brāhmanic age. The *Mahā-Bhārata* declares (Śānti-parvan, cccii, v. 7,11053) that—

'Perception is basic with the Yoga, Śāstric certainty with the Sāṃkhya, and both these in my view, O Sire Yudiṣṭhira, are truths.'

We have now to deduce the schema which in fact emerged, and that quite explicitly, from this long and complicated evolution. On a previous occasion we have urged that the period of the sophists was followed by an age of concentration, which accorded well with the establishment of imperial rule under the Nandas and Mauryas. Buddha himself was not content with the propagation of a doctrine, but spent a great part of his life in the organization of a community, an organization which, as was brilliantly expounded by the late lamented Dr. Jayaswal, was based upon the procedure of aristocratic republics existing in his time. 'The Brāhmans were not originally a caste, a sect, a community.' They were something, in fact, of a far wider and more permeating character, a class of persons whose participation was necessary for every religious incident in the lives of the people. With the formation of large states and the growth of their functions in scale and complexity, and of their influence through their monopoly of teaching, they developed a power and solidarity which ultimately threatened the entire authority of the rulers of states. This unavoidable opposition of church and state resulted perhaps in open conflicts of great moment, which have left no record but the legend of the slaughter of the Kṣatriyas by the Brāhman Paraśu-Rāma. The healing of this breach, after long experience of its inconvenience to both and a long endurance of the spectacle of a *tertius gaudens*, appears in the final form of the *Mahā-Bhārata* and *Mānava-dharma-śāstra*. In these works we find the incorporation of the *rāja-dhárma*, the theory of kingship, as a part of the general theory of *dharma*, *i.e.*, of religiously sanctioned life. This is the theory of the theocratic state ; and I subscribe to the view of Dr. Jayaswal that it corresponds in date and in essence to the emergence of a Brāhman empire, whether we attach to it the name of the Śuṅgas or that of the Kāṇvas.

But the theory of the theocratic state does not complete the scheme. We have to add the theory of the twice-born man. The idea of a second birth, or regeneration, is not unknown outside India. To be born again 'of water and the spirit' is, of course, among the great principles of the earliest Christianity ; and I need not mention that confirmation, or conversion, is a fundamental element in the doctrine of all Protestant Christian bodies and is perhaps even most conspicuous in the minds of those of more modern origin. But it is in the sphere of Brāhmanism that we can find it in the nascent stage. In the *Gṛhya* rituals the natural birth, indeed, is preceded and surrounded by sacramental observances sufficient, one might think, to invest it with a socio-religious character. But this was not sufficient for the Brāhman speculation any more than for the modern sects. In the *Brāhmaṇas* we find the priests engaged in the singular enterprize of building up an immortal body. The sacrificial altar is piled with most minute and elaborate procedures, as an embodiment of the great spirit, *puruṣa*. But for the donor of the sacrifice also there was a declared purpose of providing a new body. The dispersal of the body after death had suggested to the Vedic Indians a question as to what bodily constitution would be theirs in the life to which they looked forward after their earthly death ; and there is frequent reference to apprehension of a re-experience of death, or *punar-mṛtyu*, in that state. The object of the sacrifice was to provide the patron with an undying body. This is often explicitly declared : in the *Śata-patha*

Brāhmaṇa, for instance, we read (Eggeling's Trans., IV, p. 291)—

'Thereby (*i.e.*, by the building of an altar), the Prajāpati became immortal, and in like manner does the sacrificer become immortal by making that body (of the altar) immortal.'

And again (*ibid.*, p. 178)—

'The sacrificer, when he sings the Sāman hymns round about it (the altar), makes that body of his boneless and immortal.'

In the *dīkṣā*, or ceremony of consecration of the patron, the symbolism of a new birth is worked out in great detail. 'Him whom they consecrate,' we are told, 'the priests make into an embryo again. They conduct him to the hut of the consecrated, which is styled 'the womb of the consecrated.' They cover him with a garment, which is the caul of the consecrated. 'He closes his hands ; verily, closing its hands, the embryo lies within ; with closed hands the child is born ' (*Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, i. 3). There are many other details and observances and statements to the effect that 'the consecrated is a divine embryo,' (*ibid*, vii, 2). It is well known that this conception of a new birth by means of a sacrifice survived into comparatively late times, when kings who had undergone a certain rite with symbolical features claimed to be *Hiraṇya-garbha-prasūta*, 'born of the *Hiraṇya-garbha* (or 'Gold-embryo' rite)'.

But *dīkṣā* was not confined to special occasions of sacrifice. With *dīkṣā* commenced the period of studentship, obligatory, according to the Brāhmanic theory, upon every qualified Indian boy ; and that this experience was in fact a second, higher, birth, is in the *Gṛhya-sūtras* and *Smṛtis* everywhere accepted and reiterated. We need cite only Vasiṣṭha, who declares (II. 3) that—

'The first birth is from the mother, the second from the investiture with the sacred girdle. In that the Sāvitrī is the mother, but the teacher is said to be the father.'

We need not labour further to prove that the Indo-Āryan individual was now a 'twice-born man' in a divine society. Not less manifest is the direct contradiction of this on the part of the Buddhists, who, in the person of Aśoka, stigmatized the ceremonies as of slight value, and in the *suttas* aggressively disputed all natural superiority of Brāhmanic birth, while for society they found an origin in human convention. But the Brāhmans also, in the latest Vedic period, in a society of greatly increased complexity, were compelled to admit some relaxations of their principles. When many Brāhmans were engaged in entirely mundane occupations, they had to declare, as in the *Mahā-Bhārata* and elsewhere they frequently do, that a Brāhman by birth only, without Brāhmanic learning, is no Brāhman at all. On the other hand, the theory of the four orders was no longer adequate to the times; and so we are told that Prajāpati laid down the duties of all castes and that 'all the orders bear towards one another the relation of consanguinity, through the intermediate classes' (*Rāja-dharma*, LX., Roy's translation, p. 196, v. 1839 of text). Kṛṣṇa himself declares (*ibid*, L., Roy's translation, p. 156) to Bhīṣma that—

'The duties which have been laid down for those sprung from an intermixture of the four orders and those laid down for particular countries and tribes and facilities, and those declared by the Vedas and by men of wisdom, are all well known to thee.'

One passage in the *Mahā-Bhārata* (LXV., v. 13, text v. 2430) goes so far as to ordain Vedic duties and rites for Yavanas, Kirātas, Gāndhāras, Tuṣāras, Pahlavas residing in the dominions of Āryan kings.

In this way Brāhmanism had extended the sacramental mantle, which it had cast over the state, far enough to cover the highly complex social conditions existing in the latest Vedic age.

We do not seem to find any justification for speaking of a Buddhist period at a time when the Buddhists were only a flourishing order of monks maintained by lay adherents, whose ordinary lives were passed in the bosom of the Brāhmanic society.

III. The Period of Maturity and Organization

We have seen, I hope, that the final outcome of Brāhmanic thought in the Vedic age was the conception of the twice-born man as a member of a theocratic, or rather a divinely ordained, society. This conception, which was thenceforward explicitly instilled into all the young *brahmacārins* and was studiously impressed upon all kings and rulers from their youth upwards, had, however, been attained through a part secularization of the Brāhmans themselves. Having taken into their view of life a theory of the state and its administration, they were naturally drawn into its practical working. We can see the far-off beginning of this in the ancient office of royal *purohita*. With the development of *gṛhya* rite and custom, the Brāhman would naturally come to be consulted in regard to matters involving the like; and thus he would be associated with the work of judge or assessor in disputes: as Vasiṣṭha says (III. 7):—'What four or three Brāhmans who have studied the Vedas proclaim, that must be distinctly recognized as the sacred law, not the decision of a thousand others.' When this usage had developed into a body of customary law and then had led on to theories of legal principle and royal action, it became natural that the Brāhmans should be consulted corporately concerning particular acts of state: and this we know from the Greek reports to have been the case even in Maurya times. In the Śānti-parvan of the *Mahā-Bhārata* we read (trans. Roy, LXXXVI, 26-)—'The King should, with attentive care, inform the ascetics of the state of his own self, of all his measures and of the kingdom, and should always behave with humility in their presence.........Whatever the nature of the distress into which he may fall, he should confide in an ascetic. From among those residing in his own kingdom he should select one for friendship.' The Brāhman minister is a no less natural development; and the figure of Cāṇakya at the court of Candragupta deserves the importance which it has always had in the Indian tradition.

But the Brāhmans were also drawn into non-Vedic literature. The Pañcarātra books, which receive so much recognition in the Śānti-parvan of the *Mahā-Bhārata*, were concerned with the worship of Viṣṇu as Nārāyaṇa and Puruṣa. We may conceive that this aggrandizement of Viṣṇu had taken place rather among the lay populations of the large states than in the Brāhman schools. But, since the two elements of the conception, Viṣṇu and Puruṣa, were derived from early Vedic times, the scriptures of the *bhakti*-cult, which grew up in connection therewith, would evidently be for those schools a quite congenial subject. In the *Mahā-Bhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* the Brāhman redactors take over the functions of the court-poets and other troubadours, who were the original creators of those themes. Casual quotations in the *Mahā-Bhāṣya* of Patañjali, and the history and writings of Aśvaghoṣa, show that before the beginning of the Christian era love poetry and even dramatic works, were composed in Sanskrit by Brāhmans.

It seems likely that in these developments the spread of the art of writing may have played an important part. Perhaps the earliest literary employment of writing in Āryan India was in connection with the *sūtra* works. The limited materials for writing may have been the real cause of the extreme brevity characteristic of those works; and the term *sūtra*, afterwards applied by the Buddhists to their earliest writings, may be best explained by our modern knowledge of the string-bound written documents in an Indian dialect discovered in Chinese Turkestan. Writing was quickly adopted in India for business and official notices in vernacular language; as we see from the earliest known Brāhmī inscription, which is a notice exhibited on a *koṣṭhāgāra*, or granary, and from the Edicts of Aśoka; and it seems possible that in its extensive employment for literary purposes the Buddhists, writing in such dialects, may have been beforehand with the Brāhmans. What gave Sanskrit the victory and ultimately expelled the Prākrits from the whole official sphere may well have been the superior regularity of Sanskrit and the higher grammatical and linguistic culture of its Brāhman exponents. Amid the confusion of irregular and mixed parlances it had the advantage of being a definite norm. The replacement begins at least as early as the first century A D., though the Prākrit maintained itself in certain cases down to the third or fourth century. At about this time the Jains began to write in Sanskrit; the Sarvāstivādin Buddhists had begun long before, and the Brāhman convert Aśvaghoṣa had devoted to Buddhist themes his mastery of the language and of its developed style in poetry. The Mahāsaṃghikas are said to have used from the first the mixed dialect, *i.e.*, the colloquial Sanskrit of the unlearned, interspersed with Prākritisms.

In this way the Brāhmans had insensibly been led to take part in multifarious secular activities. Some deviations from the straight path of sacerdotal life had begun, no doubt, in comparatively early times: whence the denunciations of those who offered sacrifice on behalf of a group of persons or for a corporation or for a whole village (*Mahā-Bhārata*, Śānti-parvan, LXXVII, v. 6). When temples began to exist, there were similar denunciations of those who served as priests in them; and this objection was maintained down to the time of the law-books. But in the society of the latest Vedic period the matter had assumed proportions rendering mere denunciation of no avail: the strict doctrine of the *Varṇāśrama-dharma* could not be squared with the actual constitution of society. The difficulty was recognized even by the early *dharma-sūtras*, and it was met by the theory of the *āpad-dharma* (*Mbh.*, Śānti-parvan, LXXVIII, v. 2) and the Kali-age. It was admitted that in times of stress a caste-man might take to a normally forbidden occupation; and it was sought to minimize the evil by limitation of choice. The excuse of general application was the presence of the Kali-age, brought into existence by the uncontrollable operation of Time, a theory which had to be rounded-off by the prophecy of a future restoration of righteous order in society. In the *Bhagavad-gītā* the restoration is declared by Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva to result from periodic intervention on his own part. The special Kalki-avatāra, who is to discharge that function in relation to the present Kali-age, seems to be a later conception: its probable synchronism with the Buddhist doctrine of the future saviour, Maitreya, shows that the conception, which is found also in Zoroastrianism, was, at the period in question, prominent in the popular mind.

In this way the idea of a divine society had been patched up so as to cover not only the existence of mixed classes, but also the cases of abnormal or unorthodox occupations on the part of persons even of the highest castes. This was, no doubt, a weakening of the texture; a weakening which, however, was lost to sight in the blaze of devotion to the personal deity, Kṛṣṇa-Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa, wherewith it was associated. It served to fortify the Indian man in the faith that he was indeed a specially destined being in a theocratic society, and so to arm him against influences from without.

The influences which otherwise might have penetrated were, in order of succession, Greek philosophy, art and science, Zoroastrianism under the Palhavas and Sassanians, and Christianity, partly contemporaneous with the last.

Greek philosophy was perhaps too refined a thing to be conveyed in an effective form by Bactrian kings and soldiers; the Maurya's request at an earlier time for supply of a Greek Sophist from the Seleucid empire had been rejected with irony. In the Brāhmanic philosophers no influences from the side of Greek thought have been demonstrated; and in religion the best that the Greeks of the time could have offered was the Stoic doctrine of providence or fate, which evidently was not adequate to the case. The Greek art, which from Gandhāra did project a ray of influence as far as Mathurā and Amarāvatī, does not seem to have found anything to work directly upon outside the Buddhist milieu. Notions of Greek astronomy, though recognized as Greek, may have been received rather through a Persian intermediary, as may be indicated by the Persian associations of the name of Varāhamihira. In Zoroastrianism itself we do not find anything qualified to affect the Brāhmanic view of life : the Kuṣāṇa coinage bears, especially in its later, less Indian, stage, some marks of it ; the sun-worship, which in the *Bhaviṣya-purāṇa* is associated with Maga priests, and some Zoroastrian technicalities, could, it is evident, be quite comfortably housed in some minor section of Brāhmanic society : possibly it introduced a more considerable element into Buddhism. Christianity, which arrived early and in Southern India had a long trial, was forestalled by the *bhakti* cult and the monotheistic, personal aspect of the Protean Indian doctrine ; but it may have helped to confirm that aspect in the south. Thus the Hindu scheme of things underwent no modification from without ; and during the whole Classical period the world of Hindu intellectuality was occupied with internal debates.

It does not seem accidental that the formulation of the philosophical views in systematic *Sūtra* form belongs approximately to the period of the systematization of the socio-religious milieu in Manu and the *Mahā-Bhārata*. It closed the period of miscellaneous discussion which characterized the age of Buddha; and it provided an arena for regular controversy between organized systems. It seems to be agreed that the Mīmāṃsā and Nyāya *sūtras* are the oldest ; and this is quite consistent with the circumstances. For the Mīmāṃsā is clearly the most important for the Brāhmanic system generally, since it both lays down the principles of interpretation of the sacred texts and applies to all works of merit-earning ritual wherewith priests and laity were concerned. The Nyāya, mainly a logic of discussion, arises directly from the grammatical and linguistic observation which had begun in the *Brāhmaṇas*. That the Vaiśeṣika also was an old system, whatever the date of the *Sūtras*, is clear from its citations in the *Sūtrālaṃkāra* of Aśvaghoṣa. The cases of the other three systems are in some ways peculiar. There can be no doubt that the Sāṃkhya and Yoga philosophies, mentioned together in the *Artha-śāstra, Mahā-Bhārata* and elsewhere, are the oldest of all. If nevertheless the *Yoga-sūtra* is somewhat late, we may perhaps understand that, being mainly a practical method and widely adopted in different sects, the Yoga did not stand greatly in need of theoretic formulation. Analogous, but by no means identical, considerations may account for the lack of any, except a very late, *sūtra* compilation for the Sāṃkhya. The Sāṃkhya, in fact, did not require a *sūtra*, because originally all philosophy was Sāṃkhya and in the period represented by the *Mahā-Bhārata* and *Manu-smṛti* all speculation and theology were conceived in Sāṃkhya terms: even the Vedānta, so far as it interested any one outside the Brāhman schools, received a Sāṃkhya vesture. Hence there was no one specially concerned with a formal exposition of the system. The case of the Vedānta was perhaps the opposite of this. The *Vedānta-sūtras*, whoever had been their author, were commented upon by some early writer (*vṛtti-kāra*), in conjunction with those of the Mīmāṃsā, and later by a certain Bodhāyana, who can by no means be identified, as Max Müller suggested, with the author of the *Baudhāyana-dharma-sūtra*.[1] In the whole literature of the Classical period, until we come to the time of Saṃkara, there is an extraordinary lack of reference to the work, the word Vedānta having usually the sense of *Upaniṣad*: and we can only conclude that in the Kali-age the Upaniṣads and the pure Vedānta, with its old conceptions of *tat tvam asi* and *aham Brahmāsmi*, occupied the attention only of Brāhman scholars of Vedic subjects, while the practical interest in those truths was absorbed by the Yoga or appropriated as an arcanum by the Vaiṣṇavite and Śaivite theologies.

---

[1] Concerning Bodhāyana, Bhartṛprapañca, Dramiḍācarya, Upavarṣa, Brahmanandin, and one or two other commentators known through citations I can here only refer to the papers contributed by Professor Hiriyanna (*Indian Antiquary*, 1924, and *Third Oriental Conference*, 1924) and Professor Kuppusvāmi Sastri (*Third Oriental Conference*) and to Vols. I-III of Principal S. N. Dasgupta's *A History of Indian Philosophy* (Indexes).

A paramount interest in systematization is also exhibited by an approximately contemporary Jaina work, the *Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra* of Umāsvāti, which has a commentary by its author. Somewhat later, no doubt, is the *Abhidharma-kośa* of the Buddhist Sarvāsti-vādins, which served a rather different purpose : moreover, a formal exposition of the Buddhist *Abhidharma* had taken place earlier, and the division of the Buddhist world into numerous sects with widely divergent views precluded a single formulation of their doctrine.

With the board thus laid for close discussion there proceeded, as we know, an age-long debate, wherein especially the problems of logic and epistemology were handled with real philosophic power and originality. This development we cannot, of course, follow here. But there is one remark which may not be out of place. Despite the practice of public controversy, for which indeed a regular procedure and regular principles (*vāda-naya*) were evolved, and despite instances of life or conversion staked upon the issue, there is little evidence of violences in the discussions, and the behaviour of the disputants may be described as in general downright amiable. The normal atmosphere is well illustrated by a passage in the *Harṣa-carita*, describing the entourage of a Buddhist hermit teacher who had been a convert from Brāhmanism (pp. 235-36). 'Then in the midst of the trees, while he was yet at a distance, the holy man's presence was suddenly announced by the king's seeing various Buddhists from various provinces seated in different situations, perched on pillars or seated on the rocks or dwelling in bowers of creepers or lying in thickets or in the shadow of the branches or squatting on the roots of trees—devotees dead to all passion ; Jainas in white robes (Śvetāmbaras) ; white mendicants, followers of Kṛṣṇa ; religious students ; ascetics who pulled out their hair ; followers of Kapila ; Jainas ; Lokāyatikas ; followers of Kaṇāda ; followers of the Upaniṣads ; believers in God as a Creator ; assayers of metals ; students of the legal institutes ; students of the Purāṇas ; adepts in sacrifices requiring seven ministering priests ; adepts in grammar ; followers of the Pañcarātra ; and others besides, all diligently following their own tenets, pondering, urging objections, raising doubts, resolving them, giving etymologies, disputing, studying and explaining, and all gathered there as his disciples.' The state of tolerance illustrated in this extract may be due to the circumstance that in ethical matters most of the disputants were at one. The principles of *ahiṃsā*, benevolence, altruism, goodness, the doctrine of *karma* and the practice of spiritual exercises had been accepted by all parties. Perhaps none of them conceived as possible the extinction of any of its rivals : in the ninth century, as we know, Vācaspati-miśra, author of the *Bhāmatī* on the *Śaṃkara-bhāṣya*, commented upon all the six orthodox systems.

In another sphere, also, the principle of systematization and construction assumed a dominance which has since controlled the whole development of the more ambitious forms of literature. This is the *alaṃkāra-śāstra*, or theory of literary art, whereof the first systematic treatment is to be found in the *Bhāratīya-nāṭya-śāstra*, more or less contemporaneous with the philosophical *sūtras*. In the *Brāhmaṇas* and the early *kalpa*, *gṛhya* and *dharma sūtras* the arrangement of the treatise is dictated mainly by the matter itself ; and even in the grammatical *sūtra* of Pāṇini a rational order is only faintly perceptible amid a mass of deviations due to a mechanical convenience. A beginning of special consideration of matters of order and style we have already noted in a chapter of the *Artha-śāstra*, which itself so well illustrates the principle, and in a passage of the *Mahā-Bhārata*. As we all know, the *Bhāratīya-nāṭya-śāstra* was followed by a series of treatises on form in the drama and the higher literature, which accompanied and reacted with these latter during the whole of their subsequent evolution ; culminating perhaps in the *dhvani* theory of Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta, but continued with modifications, divergences and dissensions down to the age of Jagannātha Paṇḍita and Appayya Dīkṣita. It seems that this *alaṃkāra-śāstra*, which we cannot stay to particularize more closely, attained the conception of a poem or a verse as a sort of super-normal creation, which on the principle of *bhedābheda*, or the concrete universal, combined a multiplicity of factors and aspects, verbal, structural and emotional, in a transcendental unity, appreciable only by a cultivated faculty of soul. The great part which linguistic considerations, logic and Vedāntic ideas had in this æsthetic system need not be mentioned, since it appears explicitly in the treatises. What is here more in point is to remark that the artistic pre-occupation more and more engulfed all interest in the subject-matter. It is indeed astonishing how few are the original themes in the *kāvya* and *nāṭaka* literature, almost everything being adapted from the *Mahā-Bhārata* or *Rāmāyaṇa* or from popular versions of the same. Even the morality plays, such as the *Prabodha-candrodaya*, go back in conception, as Aśvaghoṣa's early play shows, to an old expedient of literature, dealing metaphorically with abstractions as persons or material objects. This natural device is exemplified in the *Ṛg-Veda* itself, and it is common in other literatures, especially religious literatures, such as that of Christianity, from the writings of St. Paul onwards: also in Zoroastrianism. In India it was much favoured by Jain writers, and the later poetry, such as that of Kabīr and his own followers, is obsessed by it to a quite wearisome extent.

On another occasion I have dwelt upon this artistic pre-occupation of the whole of the Classical Sanskrit literature as its main differentia in relation to that of the Vedic period. This needs a little explanation. For, on the one hand, the classical author must be interested in the working out of his subject: and, on the other hand, it may be asked how without literary art we can have literature at all. In the *Ṛg-Veda* there is plenty of literary skill and even some artifice: the *Brāhmaṇas* have a terse manner of expression, which fits the subject-matter and is always manly, at times forcible; the *Upaniṣads* have style in a very deep sense; naturally the *Mahā-Bhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa* have distinctive styles, being outcome of an old professional pre-occupation with poetry; also we find in them employment of turns of expression afterwards known in India by technical names; and even in the story of Nala we can see examples of the Gauḍa style. The Pāli writings in prose and verse are also mostly work of practised hands; and the Jaina *Aṅgas* have even some features of conscious ornamentation. All this, however, seems not incompatible with the broad distinction which we seek to draw. The authors of those works are interested, whether as professionals, preachers or students, primarily in their subject-matter; the literary art is secondary, often merely instinctive, a matter of inspiration, happy ingenuity or mastery. In the Classical literature, on the contrary, the art achievement and the critical appreciation are the main thing: its triumphs are those of subtle working out of ideas and extreme refinement of self-conscious sentiment and observation. The reader's interest follows suit: the Vedic literature is strong in its originality and in our common humanity, while the Classical requires for background the Indian man and his scheme of things. We must not carry this interpretation too far; on the one hand, we have evidence that, whatever the nature of the interest taken in the purely classical literature, it was an interest keenly felt both by the authors themselves and by a wide public: and, on the other hand, there was not a real lack of new matter associated with strong human sentiments. To this we may return in a moment.

Meanwhile we may just notice that in the departments of science and technique, the departments of the *śāstras* in general, systematization was implicit from the outset, and there is no need to follow its working during our period. But it is clearly evident also in theological matters, such as the conception of the four *vyūhas* and ten *avatāras* of Viṣṇu, the schematism of Śaiva doctrine, and above all in the geography and cosmology and hierarchy of worlds, real, imaginary or doctrinal, or psychological, in Hinduism, Buddhism and Yoga.

We now come to the matter of sentiment, which, as we all know, is the choicest topic of the *alaṃkāra* literature. A characteristic of the period is the absence of national depression. None of the writers is ever daunted by a suspicion that there may be a foreign wisdom or standard of taste which should be taken into consideration; and this gives to speculations and artistic development a spontaneous fearlessness and weakens the restraints of commonsense. Hence among much that is traditional or pedantic we often have in regard to the whole movement, or the spirit of a particular author or work, the feeling of a free activity of mind. Such we may find, for instance, in Kālidāsa and Bāṇa and in the whole development of the *alaṃkāra* and philosophical literature. It is clearly no accident that the finest classical literature belongs to the period of the Guptas and their successors, when the Indians were politically under their own control: and the activity of internal debate and intellectual discussion reminds us of the period of Buddha together with that of the Mauryas. Though the foreigner was a familiar figure and was, no doubt, a *mleccha*, the designation had lost the seriousness of the earlier Brahmanic orthodoxy; yet in Kālidāsa we do find a trace of a certain feeling of patriotism in regard to India.

A second symptom, refreshing amid the general seriousness of the Sanskrit literature, is a certain exuberance of spirit, accompanied by a richness of expression and a frank mundane criticism of the conventional in morality and religion. The richness of expression we may find in Bāṇa's *Harṣa-carita* and *Kādambarī* and in the *Setu-bandha* of Pravarasena, but also in Buddhist Sanskrit works, such as the *Lalita-vistara* and Āryaśūra's *Jātaka-mālā*. The rather flippant defiance of orthodoxy is seen in certain minor works, *e.g.*, some *bhāṇas* belonging to the period, in the sixth-seventh (?) century play entitled *Bhagavad-ajjukīya*, by Bodhāyana, which roundly takes to task the Sāṃkhya and other doctrines as a guide to life, and in the later *Caura-pañcāśika* of Bilhaṇa: also, as a *pūrva-pakṣa* case, in the *Daśa-kumāra-carita*. We are amused to read, as in English literature of the eighteenth century, of the escapades and gay parties of frolicsome youth. In poems, plays and stories there is constant reference to drinking parties and pleasure *goṣṭhīs* of an even less estimable character. But more refined social gatherings, for the purpose of music or dancing or harmless games, are mentioned in the *kāma-śāstra* and in the general literature. We have here the evidence of a rich social life among even middle-class people. Much of it, even if it had existed in the times represented by the Epic, would have been beneath the notice of the dignified, religiously disposed, older literature, or would have incurred only its censure. But it would have looked with sympathy upon—

> 'Those gatherings of heroes, when throughout the day the cheeks of warriors bristle, as stories go round full of the delight of famous fights' (*H.C.*, p. 159)

and its heart would have gone with the travel-returned Bāṇa, when he inquired of his relatives (*H.C.*, p. 71):

> 'Have you been happy all this time? Does the sacrifice proceed without hindrance, gratifying the Brāhman groups by its faultless performance? Do the fires devour oblations with ritual duly and without flaw performed? Do the boys pursue their studies at the proper time? Is there the same unbroken daily application to the Veda? The old earnestness in the practice of the art of sacrifice? Are there the same classes in grammatical exposition, showing respect by days not idly spent in a series of emulous discussions? Is there the old logic society, regardless of all other occupations? The same exceeding delight in the Mīmāṃsā, dulling all pleasure in other authoritative books? Are there the same poetic addresses, raining down an ambrosia of ever-new phrases?'

A further note of individuality may perhaps be seen in the emergence of literary persons of adventurous character, analogous in a way to religious adventurers such as Padmasambhava. We need not shrink from recognizing in Kālidāsa himself a touch of this ; but it is more developed in the case of his 9th-10th century counterpart, Rājaśekhara, and in Bilhaṇa. Here the individual author claims an interest independent of his works, and we are eager to trace the incidents of his actual career. Naturally India must have been full of such persons in courts and social life, literary men by profession and not representative of any sectarianism or organized group. An emergence of the personal may be seen also in the biographical character of some works of the period.

There were, of course, other natural sentiments which either inspired, or were deliberately portrayed in this literature : one of them being the feeling for nature. But we can refer only to the erotic. In the Classical period a dwelling on the love sentiment, whether by way of luxuriance, as in the *Saundara-nanda* of Aśvaghoṣa, or by way of studied refinement, as in the centos of Hāla, Bhartṛhari and Amaru, appears early. In Kṛṣṇaism, as reinforced by the childhood legends, the religious *bhakti* acquires a like exaggeration and refinement ; and in the end the two species, erotic and religious, become, as is well known, practically merged into one. In this studied emphasis on sentiment we have a marked departure from the old psychology. The Vedic literature has, indeed, no lack of human sentiment. The feeling for nature shown in the hymns to Uṣas, Araṇyānī, etc. ; the pathos of the stories of Śunaḥśepa, Naciketas and of several boy students in the *Mahā-Bhārata* ; the pathos, again, of some episodes in the *Mahā-Bhārata*, those for instance of Damayantī, Sāvitrī and Draupadī, and its abundant exploitation of the heroic, the tragic and the horrible ; the heroic and pathetic in the story of Rāma and Sītā ; the compassion of Buddhism, as exhibited in the Pāli canon and in Aśoka's Edicts, are communicated with full intent on the part of the author. But they are all of the manly type. There are no exuberances or excessive delicacies of the love sentiment : the *bhakti* of Kṛṣṇa-worship takes during this period the form of straightforward praise of him and unlimited exaltation of his attributes. Since in the Mahāyāna scriptures the emotion of altruistic compassion shows exaggeration of the sentimental at the expense of the intellectual, we are tempted to ascribe the similar development in the Hindu sphere not merely to the influence of changed conditions and difference of date, but rather to a modification of temperament, induced perhaps by mixture of race. In the main literature of the Classical type this element is for the most part kept under control. Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti have more of it than Bhāravi and Māgha ; but in the first it is restrained by his rare sensitiveness of taste, and in the second by predominance of intellect. The Jaina literature seems never to have been invaded by sentimentality.

Of course, we are not contending that by the aid of two principles, that of a certain scheme of life and that of literary art, even as fortified by study of natural sentiments, we can account for the whole non-technical literary product of a long period. The simple love of telling a story, with or without a moral, has pervaded Indian literature from Vedic times down to the present. It is found in the *Brāhmaṇas* and is the normal procedure in the *Upaniṣads*. Even the didactic portions of the *Mahā-Bhārata* are cast mainly in this form : and in our period, whether we turn to works of a mainly non-didactic character, such as Guṇāḍhya's *Bṛhat-kathā* and its derivatives, the *Daśa-kumāra-carita* and so forth, or to those which have sectarian or other dogmatic tendency, we find a facility and skill in narrative, which spring from a real endowment of the Indian mentality. Of course, many of the works may be brought under the category of literary art, or are designed to be so brought ; and indeed the very faculty of creating a story is itself an artistic endowment. But it belongs to art as an instinctive activity, and not to the critical, self-conscious method of the *Mahā-kāvyas* and dramas. We must not forget the existence of large departments of the literature, such as the *purāṇas* and the primary religious works of sects, *āgamas* of Vaiṣṇavas and Śaivas, *Purāṇas*, etc., of Jainas, *Avadānas*, etc., of Buddhists, which are in the older styles and in which the chief interest relates to the subject-matter, which may be novel. But even here there is a tendency to replace the original, more popular, compositions by new ones of a more systematic, or artistic, character. Thus we have the formal exposition of the Kashmir Śaivism ; and elaboration of poetic art is seen in some Purāṇas. Kṣemendra gives us *mañjarīs*, in kāvya style, of the *Mahā-Bhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* ; in Bāṇa's *Harṣa-carita* and *Kādambarī* the stilo culto, or euphuistic style, does indeed triumph through the writer's immense richness of fancy and full humanity : what it might be without that we may judge from Subandhu's handling of a story of Udayana and Vāsavadattā. Somadeva's *Kathā-sarit-sāgara* and Kalhaṇa's *Rāja-taraṅgiṇī* may be regarded as being in this matter the 'golden mean.'

It can hardly be considered a coincidence merely that in other fields also, such as architecture, sculpture and painting, conscious artistry is an outstanding feature of the same age.

Perhaps we have now considered most of the leading characteristics of the literary psychology of our period. But what of the political background ? We do not seem to find in the conception or organization of the historical states, as they appear in literature and in inscriptions, any real departure from the lines laid down in the *Artha-śāstra*, or even in Manu and the *Mahā-Bhārata*. The states are all monarchical. The rulers usually profess some form of religious preference ; and in general the dynasties have *gotra* names, derived, it has been said, from their *purohitas*. They claim military prowess and refer to victories secured by themselves or their ancestors in wars with neighbouring kingdoms. The documents are for the most part records of donations of land for religious purposes ; and especially those from South India testify to lavish provision for Brāhmans engaged in traditional Vedic studies. The terms of the grants often shed light upon legal and administrative procedures, and sometimes upon the detailed local management of the trusts. There are many particulars concerning offices of state, which vary considerably in nomenclature according to date and locality, but exhibit the same general system. Not a few inscriptions record not grants from kings, but individual or group donations of private persons, and thus give indications of numerous professions and classes in the population. South India shows the same type of state as the north. Everywhere the society seems to have become milder and more complex; and the old distinction of just four classes or castes is no longer significant.

Considering the stereotyped character of the royal aims and procedures and the ups and downs of states, void of final result or progress, and remembering the theories of the works on state-policy into which they were fully initiated, we are reminded of the formal struggles of the cities of Italy in the early Middle Ages of Europe; and thus, rather to our surprise, we find in the sphere of politics something of the same theoretic systematization which seems to be dominant in the realm of thought.

Our period has a somewhat indefinite commencement. We assume that the *Mahā-Bhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*, though their final redaction belongs to the centuries of systematization, represent essentially an Āryan or Vedic age, which in its late and latest workings gave birth to all the Brāhmanic, and the not specially Brāhmanic, philosophies and sciences, and to a rather definite Indian mentality. The following period was one of free and active, but not particularly unamiable, discussion, all the parties having much in common. There was great progress in logic, epistemology and philosophy generally and in creative reflection upon other departments of thought. It was not a Buddhist period: Buddhism by its direct denial of the whole theory of Brāhmanism, its *ātman*, its theocratic state and specially Indian point of view, was throughout an uncomfortable element. It was strong in its original, genuine, inspiration of philanthropy (*maitrī*) and compassion (*karuṇā*), in its great empire outside the confines of India, and in the zeal of its missionaries and the philosophic genius of its dogmatic leaders. But by reason of its monastic celebacy, and the background of Brāhmanism in Indian life, its social attachment in its birthland was weak, and it was accordingly not fitted to survive defeat or loss of morale.

IV: The Vedānta Period

The eighth and ninth centuries A.D. may be characterized as a period when the old chief centre of Hindu culture, the Madhya-deśa of Hindustan, underwent eclipse. In c. 733 (6?) A.D. Yaśovarman, the last representative of the families of Harṣa and the Maukharis, sustained a severe defeat at the hands of king Muktāpīḍa of Kashmir, which country was entering upon a period of great prosperity. The venture for power on the part of the Kashmiris was, doubtless, encouraged by the resentment of the States of north-west and western India, which had all, from Gandhāra to Sindh, been in conflict with the empire of Harṣa. Eastern India, from the time of Harṣa's death, had passed out of the control of the Kanauj empire, and to an undefined extent had been harassed or dominated by the Tibetans, who had secured a dominion in Nepal, or by Tibeto-Burman hill tribes, known in Bengal history as Kambôjas. Early in the ninth century was founded the Pāla dynasty of Bengal, persistently Buddhist, which also warred with some success against the rulers of Middle India.

But a movement of much greater importance was the long delayed political reaction of Southern India against the secular aggressions and superiority of the north. The process began with the conflict between Harṣa and the Calukya Pulikeśin II. This was followed by the establishment of Calukya, and later of Rāṣṭrakūṭa, kingdom in W. India. Upon the overthrow of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas through the revival of Calukya power in the Deccan, Candella princes of Central India found an opportunity of challenging successfully the suzerainty of Kanauj. Early in the same period a movement of tribes from the Indus countries, Gurjaras from northern Rājputāna and others, had begun to press forward in the present western Rājputāna and Mālwā; it has been supposed that the tribal organization of the Rājpūt kingdoms was due to that process. These peoples also were involved with various fortunes in the struggles with the Pālas and Rāṣṭrakūṭas for power in Hindustan. There is no reason for supposing that the Calukyas and Rāṣṭrakūṭas did not share fully in the general culture of northern India. From Hiuen-Tsang's account, indeed, the Calukyas would seem to have preserved in his time some rude features. But in regard to the tribal peoples, Gurjaras, Candellas, Bundelas, and others, we may entertain a doubt. The people of the lower Indus countries had from Vedic times borne only a semi-Indian character; and the afforested mountain districts to the south of the Jumna had also perhaps been only partly Hinduized. In consequence of this new character in the later ruling powers of northern India, the Tomaras, Gāharwārs and Candellas, the conditions of society and literature seem to have undergone a change; this is not so apparent in the old literary centre of Mālwā, where the Paramāras under Muñja and Bhoja created a sort of local epoch in Sanskrit literature. Elsewhere conditions analogous to the age of the old epics seem to have been restored; and they gave rise to a ballad poetry of chivalry and romance, which constitutes the beginning of popular vernacular literature in Hindustan. Kashmir was unaffected by this process, and its remarkable contributions during the ninth, tenth and later centuries to poetry, philosophy, literary criticism and narrative were all on the lines of the classical culture.

In southern India the original organization had been due probably to the adventures of Kṣatriya Princes and Brāhman settlements, a process which is perhaps attested by the prominence of Paraśu-Rāma and Arjuna in the legends. During the later ages the ruling dynasties of the Deccan usually claimed descent from one or other of the Sun, Moon or Fire lineages, or at least from the Mauryas. But Āryan migration met perhaps with more resistance in the relatively advanced culture of the south, as compared with its early progress in Hindustan. Kṣatriyas at no time constituted a considerable element in the population, and the isolation and superiority of the Brāhmans were preserved more definitely than in the Āryan milieu of the north. Hence the Vedic studies were maintained in greater purity and activity, as is the case down to the present time, when so many early works, forgotten in northern India, have been found preserved in the libraries of South Indian scholars. The remarkable intellectual vigour of the Tamil Brāhmans, in particular, has given them an influence even in Benares, the very hearth and shrine of Sanskrit culture in Hindustan. But southern India, though it adopted with rigidity the conception of a *dharma* for each caste, was not in a situation to lay stress upon the conception of a theocratic society, and royalty was perhaps less restrained than in the north.

Jainism is said to have spread to Southern India in the time of the Maurya Candragupta, and it has persisted with little persecution, except under the Colas, until the present day. By the Vijayanagar kingdom it was treated with benevolent protection. Buddhism, which arrived probably in the time of Aśoka, must have secured a wide acceptance. By about the first century B. C., as is proved by the cave-beds in the Madurā region, exactly similar to the very numerous dwellings of like nature found over a considerable area in Ceylon, it seems to have been continuous with Singhalese Buddhism. Scattered images and other objects have been found even in Travancore, where also the term *Śāstā*, originally applied to Buddha, has been preserved in the sense of 'God.' The splendid monuments at Kārle, Nāsīk, Ajaṇṭā, Ellora, and elsewhere and the ruins of Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunīkoṇḍa, with their numerous dedicatory inscriptions, attest a long period of influence: during the first 3 or 4 centuries A.D. the religion was patronized by certain dynasties or individual rulers. The earliest Tamil classics, the *Maṇimekhalai* and *Śilappadigāram*, refer to it with respect. That in the seventh century A.D. it was definitely declining in the western Deccan is evident from the cessation of cave-building at Ajaṇṭā and from the succession of Jain and Hindu activity at Ellora to the original occupation of the Buddhists. But in the Telugu country the religion survived long enough to influence the beginnings of the literature in that vernacular. The progress of its decay in Southern India has to be estimated from the seventh century statements of Hiuen-Tsang, who found it dominant in Uḍra and fairly strong in Mahā-kosala, Drāviḍa (capital Kāñcī), Mahārāṣṭra and the Koṅkan, decidedly weak or ruined in Koṅgoda, Kaliṅga, Andhra, 'Dhanakoṭa' and 'Chuliya.' In the latter, and also in Drāviḍa and the extreme south (Malakūṭa), he notes the presence of numerous Nirgranthas, *i.e.*, Jains. Malakūṭa still had some followers of the true doctrine.

The Vedānta, as we have seen, was practically ignored during the whole of the Classical period. In an age when discussion centred chiefly upon logic, epistemology, metaphysics and religious doctrine, the old *mahāvākyas* were no longer, we may surmise, up to date. By most of the active systems, Jaina, Buddhist, Mīmāṃsā, Sāṃkhya, Vaiśeṣika, Nyāya, they would have been contested; and in the theological doctrines of the Vaiṣṇavas and Śaivas, descended mainly from the popular Sāṃkhya of the *Mahā-Bhārata*,—perhaps similarly also in the common life,—they cannot have been more than tolerated as old material adapted into devotional feelings towards a personal divinity. In the general literature the only mention of Vedāntists known to me is Bāṇa's reference (*Harṣa-carita*, trans., p. 162) to 'Vedāntists skilled in expounding the nothingness of the fleeting world.'

Dr. Thibaut in his careful discussion of the original purport of the *Vedānta-sūtras*, arrived at a somewhat paradoxical conclusion. The tendency of the *sūtras* themselves was, he found, more in accord with the views of Rāmānuja than with those of Śaṃkara, whereas the latter more correctly represents the main thought of the Upaniṣads. The reasonableness of the first part of the conclusion is evidenced from the fact that one of the authorities recognized by the *sūtras* is the *Bhagavad-gītā* and that the *sūtras* also refer 'to certain Vedāntic portions of the *Mahā-Bhārata*, especially the twelfth book, several of which represent forms of Vedānta distinctly differing from Saṃkara's teaching, and closely related to the systems of the Bhāgavatas.' Concerning the Upaniṣads nothing need be said, except that their real essence would probably have best been preserved in strictly *śrauta* circles, rather than among communities affected by faiths of partly independent origin.

According to this plausible view of Thibaut the study of the *sūtras* will have been transmitted mainly by scholars of Bhāgavata proclivities; and the impression, which Rāmānuja gives, of having behind him a tradition, as contrasted with Śaṃkara's ignoring of predecessors, may have a real foundation. Śaṃkara, who is said to have been born in 788 A.D., is earlier than the formation of the new Nyāya, which appears first in the *Tattva-cintāmaṇi* of Gaṅgeśa (*circa* 1200 A.D.). He does not employ its technicalities of definition, with *avacchedakas* and so forth; but he does employ the old, elaborate, method of discussion, giving long *pūrva-pakṣas, apara-pakṣas* and *siddhāntas*. His argument deals with the real substance of the philosophies which he rejects, Sāṃkhya, Vaiśeṣika, Śūnya-vāda and Vijñāna-vāda of the Buddhists, and the views of the Bhāgavatas and Pāñcarātras.

He is primarily a metaphysician, perhaps little interested in the epistemological and logical controversies which had been carried on between the Buddhists and the Nyāya school. Thus he is in the main a descendant of the old Brāhmanic interpreters of the Vedānta, which in the Kerala country, with its long tradition of Brāhmanism and in its politically protected situation, had perhaps never been really swamped by Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava enthusiasms. He could not help being acquainted with the tenets of Buddhism and Jainism, both perhaps still living in his country. We ask ourselves how he escaped an acquaintance with Christianity, which was still alive in that region.

It has frequently been contended, and is perhaps generally acknowledged, that in the *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* of Gauḍapāda we have clear evidences of acquaintance with Buddhist ideas and terminology and of a tendency to conceive of the *Brahma-ātman* rather on the lines of the Mādhyamika Śūnyatā-vāda. And the resemblance of the transcendent *Śūnyatā*, with its negative determinations, to the Vedāntic Brahma, as conceived in the saying *n=eti n=eti*, is in fact so striking that writers have found it necessary to emphasize the great difference : what fundamentally distinguishes the Vedānta from the Buddhist view, itself possibly inspired in part by early Vedāntism, is its essential positivity. The *Brahma-ātman* is something which is given, here and now, in every moment of consciousness.

That Śaṃkara himself must have been acquainted early with Mādhyamika doctrine is evident from the facts of his career. Born in the year 788 A.D., he received inspiration from a teacher Govinda, dwelling by the Narmadā river; and later he won as a disciple an opponent Maṇḍanamiśra, residing at Māhiṣmatī. These residences were not far distant from the country of Mahā-Kosala, where in the first half of the seventh century the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen-Tsang found the Mahāyāna Buddhism still flourishing, with 100 Saṃghārāmas and about 10,000 monks. Moreover, the country was still full of the story of Nāgārjuna and king Śūdraka, and of his pupil, Ārya-deva. In the Āndhra country, indeed, though associated with the memory of Dignāga, the great Buddhist logician, and in Dhānyakaṭaka (Amarāvatī), the Buddhist religion, Mahāyāna, was not strongly represented; but we may remember that the name of Nāgārjuna is still preserved at the site of the Nāgārjunīkoṇḍa stūpa. Mahārāṣṭra and the Koṅkan, both not too remote from Māhiṣmatī, maintained each 100 Saṃghārāmas and respectively 5,000 and 10,000 monks, partly Mahāyānist and partly Hīnayānist.

Can we then point to any features of Saṃkara's system which may be due to contact with the Buddhist conception?

It seems possible to indicate one which concerns his whole method. It is certain that he was acquainted with the fundamental Mahāyāna doctrine of progressive interpretation of the canonical texts. In his commentary on *sūtra* II.2.28 he observes on behalf of the Vijñāna-vādins (Thibaut, I, p. 418)—

'The doctrine of the reality of the external world was indeed propounded by Buddha conforming himself to the mental state of some of his disciples, whom he perceived to be attached to external things; but it does not represent his own view, according to which cognitions alone are real.'

The analogy between the Mahāyāna position, fully expounded in the *Lotus-sūtra*, and Saṃkara's own critical procedure, distinguishing the *parā* and the *aparā vidyā*, and between the corresponding texts, is, when we once observe it, striking. We cannot but be confirmed in our view when we remark further the concession to common life and common sense, a concession so irrationally made by Buddhists and Advaitists jointly, in the distinction which they draw between the *saṃvṛti-satya* or *vyavahāra-satya*, the conventional truth, and the *pāramārthika-satya* or absolute truth. That the unreasonableness was felt by the followers of Saṃkara themselves, as well as by the Buddhists, is shown by the fact that, like the Buddhists, they finally declare that the real truth is unstatable;—indeed the Vedāntists are proud of the logical contradictions involved in the doctrine of Māyā, and both adopt an ultimate mysticism.

A second feature which presents an incongruity in Saṃkara's doctrine may be due not so much to Buddhism merely as to the long controversies upon epistemological questions which had been waged between all the schools. This is the doctrine of superimposition, *adhyāsa* or *adhyāropa*, which appears prominently in the *bhāṣya* on the first *sūtra* and is, in fact, essential in Saṃkara's doctrine as he states it. It is illustrated (Thibaut's trans., I, p. 5) by citation of the 'popular view,' which is indeed the stock example of the logical debates, namely that 'mother-of-pearl appears like silver.' At this moment I am unable to state with certainty whether the technical terms *adhyāsa* and *adhyāropa* are found prior to Saṃkara; but the question of perceptual, etc., error is, of course, the same which the prior philosophies had endeavoured to solve by means of the various *khyātis*. Saṃkara, whose *vyāvahārika* views are realistic,—and who admits degrees of reality, or unreality, in the objects of dream experiences, the normal world, and illusions respectively—therein following in part the famous old Upaniṣad simile of the fish and the two banks of the river—need not have taken this view, though it was convenient for a certain purpose. He might have held, as the Prābhākara school of Mīmāṃsā had held long before, and as Rāmānuja was to maintain later, that all experiences have objects real in the respective degree. We may suspect that his semi-idealist doctrine of super-imposition originated, if not in his knowledge of the Buddhist *vijñāna-vāda*, which he controverts from a realist point of view, at least in recollection of its controversy with the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, which solved the problem rationally on its own lines by offering an explanation of both truth and error in perception.

In general we remark in Saṃkara, as before mentioned, a quite limited use of logical technicalities and technical procedures, which certainly were in his time rather fully developed. Moreover, in his refutation of the Vaiśeṣika categories, *samavāya* and so on, he does not go far on the path of the sophistic dialectics of Nāgārjuna. The greatest part of his *Śārīraka-mīmāṃsā-bhāṣya* is concerned with discussion of Upaniṣad passages, *vidyās*, and so forth. His commentaries on Upaniṣads, which for the most part manifest a sure philological insight, combined with a profound knowledge of the old language, show that this was the main subject of his meditations. Essentially his motto is the same as subsequently announced by Rammohan Roy, 'Back to the Upaniṣads.' For this purpose he appropriates from predecessors more attached to the Vaiṣṇava theology, namely the Pāñcarātras and Bhāgavatas,—whom he controverts lightly, admitting (II. 2. 42) that their system agrees in part with his own—their old property, the *Vedānta-sūtra*. He introduces the sweeping new principle of the double interpretation, and develops the old notion of *māyā* in consonance with the Buddhist theory of the *saṃvṛti-satya* and the matured epistemological conceptions which had emerged through a long period of discussion.

Can we in any measure account for the great success which the ideas of Śaṃkara achieved? Much, of course, must be attributed to their philosophic profundity and to the genius of their author ; also to the very energetic personal propaganda, wherewith he is always credited and which created at the four extremities (more or less) of India establishments with pontifical successions still maintained. Among subsidiary causes we may reckon also the political prestige which in Śaṃkara's time the south of India must have possessed. But the main factor may have been the attention attracted afresh to the Upaniṣads themselves. The idea of the *ātman*, soul of our souls and at the same time soul of the universe, an idea never so affectingly set forth as in those ancient texts, has, when the texts are recalled to mind, an unfailing appeal to the higher intellectual emotions. Śaṃkara, appearing, at the end of an age of philosophizing, with a system which claimed to reinstate those texts as the *siddhānta* of many *pūrva-pakṣas*, would have seemed to be giving to people what they had all along desired, if they had not suspected it of unsubstantiality, or even to be restoring something which, disguised by accretions, they had possessed from of old. But possibly in this same connection a further, more specific, factor may be suggested. The essence of the *alaṃkāra* speculation, with its *ānanda-rasa*, was in itself a Vedāntic conception : what is more, it was Vedāntic in a historical sense, since the special aesthetic *ānanda* clearly falls under, and the more it is refined the more it becomes identical with, the *ānanda* of the *ātman* in the oldest Upaniṣads. Thus at one stroke the *advaita* of Śaṃkara wins the adherence of all the poets, and, with their cultured following, confiscates the labours of generations of aestheticists. To all this the Buddhism of earlier periods might have offered effective opposition by means of its powerful dialectic and by the strength of its genuine philanthropic inspiration, which even in the time of Harṣavardhana was signalized by a ceremony of unparallelled impressiveness, enacted for the benefit of the Chinese visitor, Hiuen-Tsang. But the decay which in many parts of India was manifest to Hiuen-Tsang had, no doubt, advanced further: from the history of Padmasambhava, as well as from the Buddhist literature of Central Asia, we can definitely discern that the humanistic enthusiasm of the Mahāyāna Bodhisattva doctrine survived only as a profession, a *pratirūpaka-dharma*, as the Buddhists themselves designate it, in a world of Tāntric magic and exorcism. In the Sanskrit plays and stories also, the Buddhist monks and nuns are accorded no respectful social consideration.

The conditions under which the *advaita* of Śaṃkara triumphed suffice to prove that it did not flourish as a doctrine of pessimism, a consolation for political downfall or individual disappointment and lack of interest in life. Perhaps that has never been characteristic of it, since it is an active and propagandist faith. But we are yet far from having justified the expression 'Vedānta period,' which I, somewhat rashly, proposed to apply to the following age. We may adduce some reasons to support it. The first of these, if we leave out of consideration the immense literature to which the Saṃkara Advaita has given birth, exceeding, so far as Sanskrit is concerned, that of all competing systems, and the even more extensive literature which it has influenced, is the existence of the other expositions of the *Sūtras*. The *prima facie* presumption is that they were all called into existence by the work of Saṃkara, which is certainly prior in time to them all. Should the commentary of Bodhāyana ever be brought to light, possibly it may be found to be of a character rendering it not repugnant to this surmise. Rāmānuja may well have been the inheritor of a tradition, without having any pre-Saṃkara predecessor whose work could be, so to speak, an official exposition of the doctrine of his school on the basis of the *Upaniṣads, Bhagavad-gītā* and *Vedānta-sūtras.* That seems to be the point. Moreover, the work of Rāmānuja is prominently controversial in regard to Saṃkara. Much more markedly is this the case with the works of Madhva and his school. The others, Nimbārka, Vallabha and the rest, we need not particularize ; but the recent publication of a huge Śaiva *Bhāṣya* on the *Sūtras*, the *Śrīkara-bhāṣya,* enforces the lesson that it became a recognized principle that every great orthodox school of sectarian doctrine should have a formal exposition on the basis of the *Vedānta-sūtras* : and this result seems attributable to the example set by Saṃkara. But in any case it clearly supports, and does not conflict with, the idea of a Vedānta period.

But may we not ask further whether the *advaita* notion is not really implicit in the whole subsequent literature, so far as it is not controverted? In the relation of the *Brahma-ātman* doctrine to the sectarian faiths there may often in the last resort be a doubt as to which has swallowed the other. It may perhaps be the case that in one period, say the classical and *Purāṇa* period, the theological aspect was the more fundamental, while in another, say in a post-Saṃkara period, the reverse may have been the case. It is in this way that we might meet the query whether in reality the post-Saṃkara age is not better characterized by resurgences and new developments of Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism, both in southern and in northern India, as indicated by the following of Basava, Viṭhoba, and other important movements in the south, the Kṛṣṇa-*bhakti* of the *Gīta-govinda* and the Caitanya school in the north-east, the Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva poets and poetesses, Lallu, Mīrā Bāi, and others, an immense multitude, of whose works in Sanskrit and the modern languages we can have no adequate conception. An effective reply to this objection does not, in fact, seem feasible, except through the expedient which we have already indicated. In connection with that expedient it is interesting to quote from a great modern poet, whose work is notably characterized by personal expressions in regard to the supreme reality: 'Limitation of the unlimited,' he writes, 'is personality: God is personal when he creates.'

If we go on restricting the inquiry to Sanskrit literature, a competitor may still be discovered in another study, and that is the *Navya-nyāya* or new logic, definitely formulated in the *Tattva-cintāmaṇi* of Gaṅgeśa of the 12th century A.D. In favour of this study, which has been so emphatically denounced as an intolerable, endless exercise in hair-splitting formalism and as adducing nothing new in the way of doctrine, much more might be said than seems at first sight possible. For, as regards new doctrines, may we not say that we do not want any of them, if they are illogical? In fact, the new *Nyāya* is a subject which at Benares, at Nadiyā and in the south has occupied a considerable proportion of the acutest minds among the learned of India; and no one who has been present at a discussion of Nyāya Paṇḍits will deny that they are keenly interested in their subject and seem to find definite matters for argumentative debate. As we penetrate a little deeper, we realize that the problems which underlie their discussions are the possibility of a perfect definition, the conditions of inference and the nature of truth and error. If these are really serious philosophical problems, it does not seem possible to deal with them on the lines of the famous declaration of a statesman, 'When I meet with a difficulty, I look it squarely in the face and pass on.'

But what renders the *Navya-nyāya* a serious candidate for supremacy during the later post-Śaṃkara periods is the fact that it tended to embrace all the other philosophic disciplines in its coils, and, what is more, it seems to be at the bottom of some of them. As regards the former point, it is evident that the formal style and precision, with arguments all in brief syllogistic form, and technical expressions, such as *avacchedaka*, *prayojaka, anyataratva, viṣayatā, ādhārādheya-bhāva,* etc., etc., more and more dominate the expositions of the various doctrines, perhaps none more than those of the school of Madhva: also some topics, such as the question of perceptual error, become obligatory, and the examples become *mūrdhābhiṣikta,* or consecrated, *i.e.,* common property, like 'Socrates' in European logic. More serious is the case when it seems that the doctrines themselves are little more than applications of logical conceptions or consequences of such. What in fact is *viśiṣṭa-advaita,* at any rate as a name, but a verbalism, affirming that the relation between the supreme being and particular beings is simply the well-known *viśeṣya-viśeṣaṇa* relation of the logic? This point may impress us a little when we reflect that Rāmānuja himself is an acutely logical thinker. We might say something analogous in relation to the *bhedābheda* doctrine, and also to the elaborate dialectical discussions of *bheda* in Vedānta writings. We must, however, reject the claims of logic as a candidate for primacy in the mentality of any age or people, despite the fact that an unconscious scheme is necessarily a logical construction; but, nevertheless, such antithetic designations as *advaita, viśiṣṭādvaita, śuddhādvaita, bhedābheda, dvaita,* seem to illustrate our proposition that a scheme of thought will usually be accompanied in any period by manifestations of its negation.

The most formidable candidate is, however, the modern languages, which from a time somewhat posterior to Śaṃkara, earlier, of course, in Tamil, began to furnish the arena for the literary activities of others than savants, professionals and continuators or imitators of old modes. The Kanarese and Telugu literatures begin to flourish in about the ninth and tenth century, the former at first under Jaina, the latter under Buddhist, inspiration. The Maithilī, or Bengali, *dohās* are, I believe, a century or two later; when the old Gujarātī begins to appear in place of the already stereotyped *apabhraṃśas,* I must leave to others to explain; and the same applies elsewhere. The superior title of the vernacular literatures would however, be clearer, were it not that the great bulk of the productions in nearly all of them, until rather modern times, consists of adaptations from the Sanskrit, with styles, metres and rhetorical embellishments largely dependent upon Sanskrit theory and practice.

We ought not to forget certain developments, which, though in themselves notable, had local or temporal limitations. An example of this is the poetry of the Caitanya movement in Bengal. But the most striking is the efflorescence of literature under the Vijayanagar empire in South India, an efflorescence manifested, as I learn from a recent volume of essays, not only in the Vedic, and Vedāntic writings of Sāyaṇa and his contemporaries, and in works connected with the Vaiṣṇava, Śaiva and Jaina religions, in commentary literature generally, in original poems, plays, biographies and works on music—all these in Sanskrit—but also in an abundant and varied original literature, in Kanarese and Telugu: also rich development of a characteristic art.

The above considerations seem to give us the formula for the post-Śaṃkara period, namely supremacy of the Vedānta. The subsequent rise of various schools of Vedānta, combining it with theism, as in the case of Rāmānuja, or with logical discriminations, as in the case of the same and in that of the *bhedābheda* doctrine; the still later importation into all philosophic discussions of the formal style of the new *Nyāya*, do not seem to qualify the truth of the observation that thenceforward the Vedānta and the Upaniṣads were in the forefront and were much adored by all the active religions. The fact that the Vedānta domination arose at a time of South Indian prosperity and prestige shows that it did not flourish as a consolatory or pessimistic faith, but as a triumph of thought.

This Vedānta doctrine is essentially a world idea, not linked to a particular people or to any theory of a divinely ordered state.

But it is still attached to India, not only by its origination there, but also by the fact that it is a super-rational mysticism, dependent for its argument upon the authority of inspired books and persons which are the property of India alone, and is accompanied by various beliefs and usages having the same limitations.

V : GREATER INDIA : 1. CENTRAL ASIA

In the preceding four lectures we have sought to indicate certain very broad lines of evolution in Indian literary mentality, corresponding to chronological periods rather vaguely defined. We have not been able to detect any considerable effects due to successful invasions or to penetrations of other kinds from abroad. It is quite likely that such influences, in respect both of particular matters and in the sphere of ideas, may in fact have been operant: something must have been gleaned from time to time from the manners, doctrines, and modes of thought of foreign sojourners, especially of rulers, races and religions domiciled during long periods in parts of the country; the traders and other adventurers, who, as individuals or in companies, have from early times constantly been pushing out into lands beyond the frontiers or beyond the sea, cannot have been entirely unobservant and cannot have failed to bring home some observations; in cases of permanent settlements of Indians, as in the regions of Further India, communications with their own country must, we should suppose, have conveyed some information concerning the conditions under which they were living. The case of Buddhism should have been specially favourable for transmission of knowledge and sentiments. Here we have an organized religious community, holding a strong position throughout the whole of its own country and at the same time serving as the headquarters of an immense colonial expansion on all sides, a ‘Saṃgha of the four directions,’ with frequent intercourse through outgoing missionaries and incoming pilgrims. A good deal of this will be discounted by the reflection that travellers are shy of talking of their experiences to their home-staying friends, who, they feel, will not understand them or take a really intelligent interest in them. Missionaries, too, share this difficulty; moreover, by their very profession, they are exporters, rather than importers, of knowledge and are somewhat armed against reflex influences, save where organization exists for the use of their exceptional information and interest. Thus experience of a general kind helps us to understand the remarkably exiguous real knowledge of the outside world which has found a place in Indian literature. But this does not seem to be quite enough. The vague knowledge which the literature betrays of countries at its very doors, Ceylon, Further India, Tibet, and even of the regions immediately west of the Indus, requires some further explanation. Possibly the tendencies resisting penetration were also those which were repugnant to information from abroad. It has often been held that any foreign influences become undetectable in Indian thought, because they are always subtly digested and absorbed in a general mentality. Similarly a realistic knowledge of outside sections of the world has had to contend with systematic constructions of a mythological character. This appears already in the Greek reports, based upon Indian information, of strange peoples living beyond its frontiers; and the *Purāṇas* show a much better knowledge of the world according to a mythological cosmology than as it must have been realized in the experience of countless merchants and other travellers.

As regards the outgoing influences, whereof we may now proceed to take some slight account, it is obvious that, whereas they were conditioned in each case by the stage reached in India at the time, the countries receiving them need not have shared in the previous evolution: this applies also to a country receiving successive influences at different stages; in such a case the country may have been not at all concerned with the actual transition from one stage to another; there the two might be quite accidentally side by side, being simply successive importations. In some cases the real chronological order might be inverted: for instance, a country converted to Buddhism during a developed Mahāyāna period might receive later from other Buddhist regions a Sarvāsti-vādin influence, and still later a Sthavira Buddhism of the Pāli type ; and the three might simply co-exist. Instances of this character may actually, perhaps, be observable.

The expansion of Indian culture over an area extending far beyond the land of its origin is now become a familiar theme, which is being systematically investigated by your 'Greater India Society,' both in its Journal and by means of special publications. The expression 'Greater India' was suggested, no doubt, by the title of Sir Charles Dilke's work on the expansion of Great Britain into an empire ; but the underlying idea is perhaps more akin to that of the spread of Hellenism in South Italy and Sicily, in Asia Minor, Babylonia with Syria and Palestine, and Egypt. It includes regions, such as Ceylon and Malaysia and Further India, Central Asia, Tibet, where perhaps the torch of literature was by its influence first kindled ; but also, in a measure, even China, where the influence of Buddhism has been pervasive and at times prominent ; and countries like Japan, Korea and Mongolia, which either possessed an indigenous literary culture of their own or were in some measure familiar with that of China. This enumeration does not cover the whole field : the early Uigur Turks of Central Asia developed a Buddhist literature ; in Oxiana a Buddhist literature must from about the commencement of the Christian era have existed among Kuṣāṇas and Tokharians ; and the *cis*-Oxus regions of Bactria, Afghanistan and Seistan have preserved considerable remains of Buddhist shrines, the second of them also written evidences in the shape of inscriptions going back as far at least as 100 B.C. In regard to the peoples of northern Afghanistan, indeed, it is likely, since to the Greeks they seemed to resemble Indians, having elephants in their armies, that they had shared from the beginning in part of the development of Vedic civilization.

According to the accepted legend, the pre-Buddhist civilization of Hindustan had reached Ceylon. The case of Further

India is obscure, and anything to be said concerning it may be reserved for another occasion : so also that of the Malay islands. Kashmir and Nepal, which must have known of Buddhism at least from the time of Aśoka, may be regarded as for our purpose parts of India ; but concerning the former we may note that the Nāga Mahāpadma of the Wular lake, whose native name we know to have been Hulura or Hulor, is stated to have been subdued by a Buddhist missionary named Madhyantika at a date prior to Aśoka : and this may point to the first introduction of Buddhist or Hindu culture into the country. The Himālayan countries between Kashmir and Nepal must have had some contacts with the Indo-Āryans even in the age of the Kuru-Pañcāla kingdom ; but the Vedic and Sanskrit literature affords us no grasp of them ; and according to the only indications which we have, except for some notes by Hiuen-Tsang in regard to Kulu and Lahul, the introduction of Buddhism into them was effected by Padmasambhava, during the last half of the eighth century A.D. ; though before that time some portion of them may have been under the rule of the Hūṇa Mihirakula and his successors and invaded by Harṣavardhana and his elder brother, Rājyavardhana. Concerning southern India we have already stated all that seems to be known. We may now turn to Chinese Turkestan.

The foundation of the state of Khotan is attributed by the local legend to a visit of Aśoka and the birth on that occasion of his son, Kustana, who, nineteen years later, came from China with a Chinese army and joined with a disgraced Indian minister, Yaśa[s], and his Indian following, in settling the country. It is not necessary at this point to consider further the implications of the legend, which evidently has for one purpose an etymologizing of the name Kustana, as a Sanskrit expression meaning 'Earth-breast.' The dating of the foundation of the city as *c.* 224 B.C. derives a certain support from the mention of the great Chinese emperor Shih-wang-te, whose reign covered the years 240-210 B.C. The Indian minister, Yaśa, which name is intended, no doubt, to denote the Yaśa[s] of the *Divyāvadāna* stories, was probably understood to have come from Kashmir, which the Khotan Chronicle evidently conceives to have been in frequent communication with its own country and which from early times was certainly in frequent communication with China. His route is not indicated, and in later times the author of the *Rājataraṅgiṇī* betrays little knowledge of the intervening countries: from the later Khotan point of view we should certainly conceive a route *via* Baltistan. A certain faint support to the idea of Kashmiri participation in the foundation of Khotan is afforded by the fact that the Nāga Hulor was in later times object of a cult in Khotan.

What measure of Indian civilization was introduced into the Khotan country at the time of foundation of the city our records do not enable us to conjecture. According to the local legend the Buddhist religion did not arrive until 165 years afterwards, at a date which may be estimated as approximating to 60 B.C. In favour of some such date we may adduce two considerations. In the first place, it is evident that at the time of Chang-kien's mission (128 B. C) to Transoxiana the Chinese had not heard of India or of the Buddhist religion: it was in the country of the Yueh-chi, Tokharistan, that the existence of India, as a remote kingdom, was made known to him. To the south of the Oxus, in Bactria, not only India, which had more than fifty years earlier been invaded by the Greek rulers of the country, but also Buddhism must have been fairly well-known: for the knowledge, which must have existed at the date, *c.*150 B. C., when in northern India the Greek king Menander was taking an interest in that religion, cannot have been obliterated by the twenty or thirty years which had elapsed since the country was first overrun, if in fact it had been overrun, by Saka, or Scythian, tribes. South of the Hindu-Kush Buddhism had before 100 B.C. been patronized, as we have already seen, by Greek rulers, and the legend of the foundation of Swat Buddhism relates even to pre-Aśokan times. In the second place, the Chinese story of

Buddhist books received in 2 B.C. by, or from, an envoy of the Great Yueh-chi (*see* the discussion by MM. Specht and Lévi in the *Journal Asiatique* 1896-7, I, pp. 14, sqq.; II, pp. 166, sqq.), renders a date *c.* 60 B. C. not improbable for the first appearance of the Buddhist religion in Khotan.

It is obvious that the Indian, or quasi-Indian, element in the original population must have contributed at least a knowledge of the art of writing. There can be no doubt in regard to the form of script, which was Kharoṣṭhī, the script of all the oldest inscriptions of the north-west. For during the third and fourth centuries A.D. the Kharoṣṭhī writing was still in sole use in the Shan-shan kingdom to the east of Khotan: except from Khotan, it could never have reached that country, there being no other route for communications. Moreover, the only really ancient MS. which has been found in the Khotan area, the famous MS. of the Buddhist *Dhamma-pada*, is in Kharoṣṭhī. It is a confirmation of this that the Chinese pilgrim, Fa-hian, who visited Shan-shan in the year 400 A.D. and there found Buddhists about 4,000 in number, all of the Hīnayāna sect, remarks concerning the population of the countries to its west that the professed disciples of Buddha all use Indian books and the Indian language: had there been a difference of script, he must have noticed it; in 529 A.D. his successor Sung-yun states concerning the kingdom next to Khotan on the west that 'the customs and the spoken language are like those of the people of Khotan; the written character is that of the Brāhmans,' *i.e.*, according to the standing sense of this expression, the Brāhmī. The citation of this fact seems to imply that Khotan used a different script, which, *viz.*, Kharoṣṭhī, we find in a document of the third or fourth century A. D., written perhaps in Khotan.

Can we point to any specific matters of Indian culture which may have come to Khotan during its pre-Buddhist period? Here we deal only with likelihoods. Clearly, however, items of administration and common life are sure to have come with the first settlers. Accordingly we may reckon with (*i*) a certain number of Greek terms in the Shan-shan inscriptions, *viz.*, *sadera* and *trakhma*=*stater* and *drachme*, 'barracks' *parambula*, which may well have been brought from the Indian side, unless indeed they came from Bactria at a still earlier date ; (*ii*) a division of the country into parishes (*sīmā*) which was recognized in India, and further into hundreds (*śata*) ; possibly also into 'thousands,' since such a division certainly existed in Shan-shan at a later date and is an Indian institution, mentioned (*sahasra-pati*, ruler of a thousand) in the *Artha-śāstra* of Kauṭalya ; (3) the ornate, formal, official and epistolary style, which is certainly Indian, developed in the Maurya chancellaries and partly preserved in India down to modern times. With the last-named we may associate the letter (*lekha*), the letter-carrier (*lekha-hāraka*) and the book (*pothī*). The town-mayor (*nāgaraka*) also is likely to have come more or less contemporaneously with the foundation of the city.

The first introduction of Buddhism is attributed to a *śramaṇa*, by name Vairocana, who by a miracle won over the king Vijayasambhava and under whose influence the first monastery in the country, that of Tsar-ma, was built. The Tsar-ma monastery was situated to the south-east of the old city and probably near the eastern river, the present Yurungkāsh. Another very ancient Buddhist settlement was to the south-west, at a distance of about 11 miles on a rather inconspicuous hill abutting on the Kara-kāsh, the western river. This hill was afterwards covered with Buddhist shrines, and became, under the name Gośṛṅga or Gośīrṣa, which recurs in Nepal, famous throughout the Buddhist world. In the local Chronicle particulars are given of the foundation of many other shrines, monasteries and nunneries, erected through the piety chiefly of kings, queens, and other royal persons, mostly upon the suggestion of chaplains, *kalyāṇa-mitras*, an institution which may go back even to pre-Buddhist times in India. The earliest establishments are attributed to 'Āryas' simply, *i e.*, perhaps, to Buddhists not differentiated as to sect: the Māhāsaṃghikas and Mahāsarvāsti-vādins, in this order, came later, the latter being at least anterior to 400 A.D., when the pilgrim Fa-hian makes mention perhaps of a monastery of that sect. Even in the time of Fa-hian, however, the monks, numbering 'several myriads,' belonged principally to the Mahāyāna, as did those of the adjacent country to the west, Cakoka or Cu-gon-pan. In the eighth or ninth century A.D. the preponderance of the Mahāyāna, which in the *māhātmya* of the Gośṛṅga hill is proclaimed in jubilant terms, is indicated by the statement that, 'reckoning the adherents of all other sects as the hairs on a horse's ears, those of the Mahāyāna would be as the hairs on its whole body.' At the latest recorded period, perhaps just before the Musalman conquest, *c.* 1000 A.D., imposing statistics of the religious establishments are given.

In the native language of Khotan, as we may assume in accordance with the statement of Fa-hian, there never was any literature at all, certainly not any Buddhist literature. From similar, and even stronger, evidence we see that the same applies to Shan-shan. In the year 445 A.D. both countries were involved in a calamity which probably put an end to Buddhist and Indian civilization in the latter and temporarily ruined it in the former. This was an invasion by a king of the Tu-yuk-hun[1] people of north-eastern Tibet, immigrants, about one hundred and thirty years previously, from northern Asia, and at this time possessing a rather wide dominion, which included Tun-huang, or Śa-cu, and probably the greatest part of Western Kan-su. Their civilization, so far as it had developed, and their script were Chinese. They retained possession of Shan-shan until replaced by the Tibetans in the second half of the seventh century A.D.: perhaps the Buddhist religion and the Kharoṣṭhī writing, together with the other Indian features in the social condition of the state, were abolished by the Tu-yuk-hun conquest. The effect of the conquest in Khotan, whence after one year the Tu-yuk-hun king, Mu-li-yen, retired, are described in the Khotan Chronicle, which declares that the shrines, as far as Mount Gośṛṅga, were all destroyed and the population greatly reduced. From what side the Buddhism of Khotan was rehabilitated we may plausibly infer from a passage in the *Sūrya-garbha-sūtra*, which between 589 and 618 A.D. was translated into Chinese. In M. Lévi's translation we read of a Nāga king's petition to Buddha for the office of tutelary there : 'O Bhagavat, confide to me the sacred place of the Caitya Gomasāragandha on the mount Gośṛṅga, in the country of Khotan. For in that kingdom cities, towns, villages, hamlets are all void and desert. Such people as there are come from other regions and other countries......'

---

[1] It is possible, however, that the calamity was due to the Juan-Juan invasion of 466 A.D.

The Bhagavat replied : 'O Nāgarāja, it is not so. For at this very moment are coming two myriads of *bhadantas* seeing the four verities, who come from the country of Kashgar and betake themselves to this country : in this place of the great Caitya of the mountain Gomasāragandha night and day they come to render homage......'

The Sūtra is well acquainted with both Kashgar and Khotan; and it seems quite possible that an importation of Kashgar monks, who in the time of Hiuen-Tsang numbered 10,000, may have been actually witnessed by the authors of the original. Relations with Kashgar are, in fact, instanced in the Khotan Chronicle. In the seventh century A.D. the script employed in Kashgar was Brāhmī, and its Buddhism was of the Sarvāsti-vādin Sect (Hiuen-Tsang, tr. Beal, Vol. II, p. 307). It would therefore be quite reasonable to suppose that the Brāhmī writing came to Khotan, along with that form of Buddhism, during the second half of the fifth century A.D.

It is at about this period, the period of a great development of the *Avataṃsaka* literature, of the Mahāyāna, that we may suppose the world of Khotan to have exercised an influence upon the actual constitution of Buddhist texts. From about 260 A.D. visits of Chinese monks and translators to Khotan are reported :

in the fourth century they were chiefly concerned with the study of the Mahāyāna. But in the *Sūryagarbha* and *Candragarbha sūtras*, and in the other similar works M. Sylvain Lévi succeeded in demonstrating an actual familiarity with the world of Chinese Turkestan and an orientation from some centre there, which will have been Khotan. It seems likely that these works were actually composed in that region, since in India proper the Buddhist world seems at that period to have been occupied mainly with matters of dogma, philosophy and logic. The works are characterized by insertion of *dhāraṇī* formulas ; and it is said that such formulas were first rendered into Chinese, in the 4th century A.D., by monks from Kucā and India.

Prior to this period the Khotanis had apparently been engaged only in the study of texts received from India. The favourite texts were the *Prajñā-pāramitā, Sad-dharma-puṇḍarīka, Candragarbha*, while in the neighbouring country of Cakoka, likewise Mahāyānist, we hear of mainly the same preferences.

Presumably soon after the introduction of the Saka-Khotanī language began the practice of making translations in that medium : to this practice we owe the Saka-Khotanī Buddhist texts, whereof fragments have been recovered from desert sites in the country itself and both fragments and whole volumes, in the form of rolls and *pothīs*, from the famous hidden library of Ch'ien-fo-tung, near Tun-huang. It may be remarked that not all the texts are of a religious character : some of them are medical, including a translation of a *Siddhi-sāra*, a work attributed to Nāgārjuna. The last-named is written in the cursive script of the later period ; the religious MSS. are written mostly in square upright characters, the so-called Central-Asian Brāhmī, which, being immediately derived from the Indian Gupta, itself sets a limit to the antiquity of the MSS. In a more or less cursive hand are the few short or fragmentary notes of dedication found on fresco paintings or textiles.

Among Buddhist works composed, no doubt in Sanskrit, in the Khotan country we have in Tibetan versions two notable items, one being the already mentioned *Gośṛṅga-vyākaraṇa*, a *māhātmya* of the Gośṛṅga hill. Both are entirely Indian and Buddhist in conception, and are in the ambitious style of thought and language characteristic of the *Sūtra* literature, in which class they are canonical. The second, the *Vimalaprabhā-paripṛcchā*, or 'Inquiry of Vimalaprabhā,' interspersed with numerous *dhāraṇīs*, was composed about 745 A.D. It is unique among Buddhist *sūtras* in that it is essentially a political pamphlet, bearing upon the situation of Khotan, *vis-à-vis* Chinese and Tibetan domination and the local dynasty, at the time. But it is also an impassioned proclamation of a mission on behalf of women, in which aspect it may reflect the influence of the action of the Chinese Empress Wu-Tsö-t'ien, who, in the year 690 A.D , claiming, in connection with a like mission to be the prophesied Buddhist Saviour, Maitreya, caused to be circulated a transmogrified version of the *Mahāmegha-sūtra*. Besides these two works we may cite two pamphlets, likewise *vyākaraṇas* or 'prophecies,' of the Arhat Saṃghavardhana and the Church of Khotan respectively. The main content of each is an *ex-post-facto* prophecy of a downfall of Buddhism in Khotan and a migration of the still faithful monks to Tibet, where at first they were hospitably entertained and then, in consequence of discontents due to a visitation of plague, expelled : after a long journey they reached Gandhāra, only again to be expelled after a sojourn of two years ; finally they all perished by mutual slaughter in the Indian city of Kauśāmbī. The occurrence, which is referred to a definite date about the middle of the eighth century A.D., is partly a distortion of old legends ; and the religion persisted, though no doubt in a rather degenerate form, down to the conquest of Khotan by the Musalmans in about 1000 A.D.

The most considerable literary work in the Khotanī language itself, edited by the late Professor Leumann under the title 'North-Arian Doctrinal Poem of Buddhism' is a composition of entirely Indian and Buddhist inspiration. It is a long epic, in somewhat elaborate metre and flowing Indian style and construction, concerning the history and advent of the future saviour, Maitreya. It has no original in another language; but its theme has been treated on many occasions in Buddhist literature, particularly perhaps in languages of Central Asia, previously known or discovered in modern times.

The remainder of the MSS. in the Saka-Khotanī language are in most cases business documents, accounts of travels and other practical matters having no special relation to India. The title of honour, *a-mo-ce*, which during this period was sometimes conferred by the Chinese upon ruling chiefs and even other persons in the states of Turkestan, is the Sanskrit word *amātya*.

The places in Chinese Turkestan which are situated to the north of the great desert may have received some intimation of Buddhism, or at least of India, at the time of the previously mentioned communications between the Chinese and the Yueh-chi during the second half of the first century B.C. It was through the country of the Yueh-chi (Tokharistan) that the monks Kāśyapa Mātaṅga and Dharmaratna are said to have carried the first Buddhist propaganda into China, where they translated five short *sūtras*. There must have been Buddhists in Kucā as early as the middle of the third century A.D., when a Kucean translated the two recensions of the *Sukhāvatī-vyūha*. Thenceforward Kucā developed a flourishing Buddhist community and cult and contributed in a considerable measure to the success of the religion in the Chinese empire. The Turfan region, further east, the old Ku-ṣi kingdom, wherein from about the end of the first century A.D. the city and realm of Kao-chang, originally (*c*. B.C. 60) a Chinese colony, was the dominant state and from the ruins of which come most of the finds of German expeditions to Chinese Turkestan, was a likewise important centre of Buddhism. Karashahr, or Yen-ki, Agni, between the two and rather to the south, and the states to the west of Kucā, namely Aksu (Bālukā) and Kashgar, were also, the last-named especially, patrons of a large number of monasteries and priests.

All these states to the north of the desert adhered to the Sarvāsti-vādin sect and used the Brāhmī script, no fragment of Kharoṣṭhī having yet been produced from the whole area. The two facts are, no doubt, connected. The Buddhism of these states came from the countries of Transoxiana, Tokharistan and Parthia, beginning, so far as both are concerned, early in the second, or even in the latter half of the first, century A.D. According to all our evidence the Kharoṣṭhī writing never crossed the Hindu-Kush northwards; and we must presume that it was the Brāhmī that was carried by the Sarvāsti-vādin school into the Yueh-chi dominion of Tokharistan. The little states in this region wherein Hiuen-Tsang notes (trans. Beal., I pp. 39-49) the existence of Buddhist monasteries and monks are termed Chaghāniān, Garma, Sumān and Kulāb, Kubādiān-Khulm, Balkh (100 monasteries and 3,000 monks: Little Vehicle), Gaz (10 monasteries and 300 monks: Little Vehicle, Sarvāsti-vādin); and in both the last two he states that they belonged to the Hīnayāna, and in the case of the last that the school was Sarvāsti-vādin.

The Sanskrit literature whereof fragments or entire works have been recovered from the northern states include a number of writings of Aśvaghoṣa, namely fragments of two plays and his hymn in 150 verses, also an old work, entitled *Kalpanā-maṇḍitika*, by Kumāralāta. There are, further, some fragments of the Sarvāsti-vādin *Vinaya* from this source, published in Berlin as long ago as 1906, some again in Oxford in 1916.

To a later period belong the works in the local languages of Kucā and Karashahr and Turfan, commonly designated Tokharī B and A. The authors of the works in dialect A use the term Ārṣī; after a long period of debate some scholars now hold that the use of the term Tokharī is based upon a very natural misunderstanding. According to that view a new question would arise in regard to the Tokharī language, which would have been a language of Tokharistan: would it be the language which we have called Śaka-Khotanī, or is it another speech, perhaps akin thereto? In any case—and there is a strong case *contra*—it was a vehicle of Buddhist literature, since Hiuen-Tsang so states and there are Uigur texts (9th century?) from the Turfan area which profess to be renderings from Tokharī.

Perhaps the oldest surviving specimens of the language of Kucā are certain official passes issued to merchants travelling in the country. A large text, a version of the Sanskrit *Karma-vibhaṅga*, has been edited by M. Lévi along with the original Sanskrit and versions or equivalents in Chinese and Pāli. The Turfan area is represented by a number of fragmentary Buddhist texts, published with facsimiles by the German scholars, E. Sieg and W. Siegling, who in collaboration with Professor Solmsen of Berlin have compiled a very extensive and thorough grammar of the dialect. The texts are in part unknown in other versions: they employ a large variety of metres, having for the most part Sanskrit names.

We have apparently no texts representing the Buddhism, which was Sarvāsti-vādin, of Aksu or Kashgar. In the latter country Zoroastrianism seems to have played a part, as was natural, seeing that the city was an emporium for trade with Transoxiana and had a differential, perhaps Iranian, population. From the district of Marālbāshi we have, in an amplified Brāhmī alphabet, which exhibits some connections with that of Turfan, and in a dialect which is a sister to the Saka-Khotanī, some documents of a business or legal character.

In a language which has been recognized as Sogdian we have both documents and texts belonging to the Buddhist and Manichaean faiths. As there were some small Sogdian colonies in Chinese Turkestan, it might be supposed that these were composed by, and for, such local communities. The Sogdians were great travellers and traders, and even in the ninth century

A.D. they can be traced as travelling merchants as far as Ladak in the western Himālaya. But it may be suggested that, since Sogdia, which was a country to the north of Tokharistan, will have been part of the Parthian empire, the Parthians, Ṅan, who from 150 A.D. worked as translators of Buddhist texts into Chinese, may well have been Sogdians, in which case Buddhism may have been from early times rather well established in their country. The first of them, however, the famous Ṅan Shih-kao, is described as a Parthian prince, and so perhaps are some of the others, which renders such a suggestion doubtful. As regards the general question of Buddhism in the countries of Western Turkestan, we may just note that, from the latter half of the second century A.D., some persons from Samarkand are mentioned by the Chinese among their translators of texts: the Tibetan accounts of Buddhist monks fleeing, *c.* 740 B.C., from persecution mention some from Parthia, Farghana and a country (Gustik) to the north-east of Samarkand. But Hiuen-Tsang fails to mention Buddhists in the cities of Western Turkestan; and from other sources we gather that the Arab conquest, early in the eighth century, found Christianity prevalent in them.

It seems probable that the Buddhist texts in Śaka-Khotanī or Kucean-Ārṣī are not later than the eighth century. Hence, though they represent the early developments of Buddhism, Sarvāsti-vādin, Māhāsaṃghika and the Mahāyāna, as late as the period of *dhāraṇīs*, they do not participate in subsequent aberrations, such as the immense Tantra and Vajrayāna literature, which arose in India and Tibet. This applies also to the Turks, who in the sixth century A.D. acquired from China some slight knowledge of Buddhism.

Under the Uigur-Turk kingdom, which from about 850 A.D. controlled the region of Turfan and perhaps also of Kucā, the Buddhist religion of those regions survived during an undefined period, and Buddhist books were composed in the Uigur language. These, however, being translations from the Tokharī, did not transcend the stage represented by their originals. The conquest of Khotan, *c.* 1000 A.D., by the Uigur Turks of Kashgar, who were Musalmans, terminated the influence of the Sanskrit literature in the whole country, except so far as it was maintained in the districts still controlled by Tibet.

VI: GREATER INDIA: 2. TIBET

At first it is somewhat surprizing to find that Tibet appears to have received no inkling of Buddhism prior to the first half of the seventh, or at the earliest, late in the sixth, century A.D. Seeing that Hiuen-Tsang found Buddhism in Kulu and visited Lahul, which reach up to high regions in the Western Himālaya, while, further east, Nepal had known of the religion from the time of Aśoka; that even in Baltistan there were monasteries in some number, while the regions west of the Indus, Gilgit, Udyāna and Swat, had probably been introduced to the faith even in the first century B.C.; that even in Ladak has been found a Kharoṣṭhī inscription, dated not later than the second century A.D.; and that to the north was Chinese Turkestan, actively Buddhist from the first century B.C. or at least A.D.; considering all this and realizing the heroism of the monks in encountering difficulties and dangers of travel and their adroitness in dealing with rude peoples, we wonder what causes had prevented penetration of a country which is not altogether inaccessible from the South (*via* Nepal and Sikkim), from the West (*via* Ladak and Gartok) or from the North (*via* Cercen and Carklik).

In regard to this question we may attend to two considerations. In the first place, the countries named, excepting Nepal, were not really in contact with Tibet proper. On the west Tibet is separated from Ladak by the highest, and almost the most desolate, region of the country, with passes going up to 19,000 feet, and usually named the *stod-ḫkhor*, or high country. Secondly, the region of Gu-ge and Spyi-ti, and we do not know how much further to the north and east, was not yet Tibetan; it was the sphere of another kingdom, the Zaṅ-Zuṅ kingdom, which probably was not overrun by the Tibetans until the time of Sroṅ-btsan Sgam-po, the great Tibetan king of the first half of the seventh century A.D. ; the Žaṅ-Žuṅ people and their language were of Tibeto-Burman character, but the language, at least, differed widely from Tibetan. Consequently, it may be suggested that Ladak also, which lay further to the west and was perhaps acquired during the same period, had previously been non-Tibetan. On the north Tibet was separated from Chinese Turkestan by vast deserts, swamps and mountain ranges, which, so far as inhabited at all, were occupied by another Tibeto-Burman race known to the Chinese as Jo (or Ñi or Ža) K'iang : and from about 315 A.D. the more eastern portion of it, where was the least difficult approach to Chinese Turkestan, was dominated by the Tu-yuk-hun people, immigrant originally from north-eastern Asia, whose civilization, so far as it existed, looked to China. The very difficult eastern border country between Tibet and China, a country of huge mountain ranges and deep gorges, was likewise occupied by Tibeto-Burman tribes, not fully subdued by the Chinese and little known to them. As regards the south, where, as we have mentioned, Nepal and Sikkim furnish at least a possibility of penetrating, it appears that the original seat of the Tibetan kingdom, Yar-lung, was in the south-east, away from the present routes from Nepal and Sikkim to Lha-sa.

But there is also a second consideration, namely the condition of the Tibetan state itself. It was originally an agglomeration of a number of tribes ; and even in the time of the historical kings the old designation, 'the eighteen districts,' was fresh in memory. The long genealogy, tracing the dynasty by successive stages back to divine ancestry, appears to be in part legendary, in part mythological ; really historical reminiscences do not go back more than two or three generations prior to Sroṅ-btsan Sgam-po. It was this great king who established the capital at Lha-sa and founded the state of Tibet.

Accordingly, apart from the nature of the country itself, the reasons for its long immunity from Indian and Buddhist influences were, on the one hand, the existence of buffer peoples on nearly all sides, and on the other, the lack of state organization among the Tibetans, known to the Chinese as 'the wild K'iang or the T'u-fan.'

Sroṅ-btsan Sgam-po was undoubtedly a great man, deserving of his commanding position in Tibetan history. It was perhaps a family connection with the important kingdom of the Tu-yuk-hun, which had succeeded in procuring a matrimonial alliance with the Chinese imperial house—a great object of ambition in rude Central-Asian States—that first gave him an inkling of what civilization was. After the foundation of his new capital at Lha-sa, he looked round for means of adorning his power with this new element of distinction and permanence. He cast his eyes first upon the nearest kingdom enjoying a civilized status; this was Nepal, at that time under the *de facto*, but not *de-jure* rule of the Ṭhākur Aṃśuvarman, whose titular sovereign represented the old Licchavi dynasty. Sroṅ-btsan Sgam-po's application for a bride is said to have met with despairing reluctance on the part of the selected princess, afterwards divinized as the 'Green Tārā.' She took with her to Tibet the image of the Buddha Akṣobhya, which is still preserved in the oldest temple (Ra-mo-che) in Lha-sa. This event must have taken place before 639 A.D. For in that year arrived in Tibet the second, even more famous, foreign princess obtained as a bride by Sroṅ-btsan Sgam-po. This was Mun-śeṅ (or Wen-Cheng) Koṅ-co, a member of the Imperial family of China. This favour was not obtained without hostile demonstrations on the part of the Tibetan king and also, according to the story which the Tibetans delighted to recount, very ingenious diplomacy on the part of his envoy. The Chinese princess also brought Buddhist influences and a statue of Buddha to the Tibetan court; but her work was more apparent in the direction of reforming the rude culture of the Tibetan people. The well-to-do were encouraged to exchange their native home-spun dress for Chinese silk : schools were instituted, and a hundred young Tibetans were sent to China to be initiated into literary culture. Already in 639 A.D. an envoy, the afterwards celebrated Thoṅ-mi-Sambota, had been despatched to Kashmir to procure an alphabet ; he returned with his mission accomplished, bringing back a scheme of letters closely modelled in form and arrangement upon the Indian Gupta writing, but with additional signs, for the purpose of representing certain sounds existent in Tibetan, and with omission of the Indian soft aspirates, which were not required. Since the existence of the Brāhmī writing of Central Asia can hardly have been unknown in Tibet, it seems possible that the desire to procure a novel script may have been a manifestation of national *amour propre* on the part of its ruler. But possibly the resort to Kashmir may have been the outcome of a compromise. The Nepal wife may have put forward a recommendation of the script used in her own country,—and indeed the ornamental writing known in Tibet at a later time as Lan-tsha is merely the Rañjā of Nepal—and opposition on the part of her Chinese rival may have been obviated by substitution of Kashmir. The alphabet in its original square form, and also in several derivative cursives of elegant appearance, has served the Tibetan language down to the present time ; it is one of the greatest boons which India has bestowed upon the country. The spelling represented, no doubt exactly, at the time the actual pronunciation, and in the western and north-eastern dialects the characteristic combinations of initial consonants are still to a considerable extent preserved ; but the central dialect, which is the normal official medium, the Mandarin, so to speak, of Tibet, has undergone extensive depravation, with consequent introduction of some new sounds and loss of consonants ; so that the writing is now very far from being a true mirror of the oral speech. The benefits of the script have not been confined to the language of Tibet proper. It has been used, of course, for the writing of special Tibetan dialects, such as those of Ladak and the Western Himālaya and that of Bhutan and those of some Tibeto-Burman dialects of Nepal. But it was also applied to at least one, not yet interpreted, language of Central Asia ; and in western Kan-su it was sometimes used by Buddhist monks for the writing even of Chinese, and so has furnished very valuable evidence in regard to the pronunciation of Chinese in that region a thousand years ago. For the Mongol Kublai Khan, a Tibetan hierarch, known as 'Phags-pa,' constructed on its basis an alphabet for writing Mongol, which, however, owing to the convenience of using the Uigur Turk script, derived from the Sogdian, has been only sparsely used.

Intimate acquaintance with Buddhism and with its literature must have been acquired by the Tibetans through their invasion and conquest of Chinese Turkestan. Even the first expeditions through the northern states, Karashahr, Kucā and Kashgar, must have familiarized them with the existence of the numerous monasteries and great companies of monks, the brilliantly painted shrines, gilt images, ornaments, flags, banners, etc., and with their books. They themselves had taken kindly to writing and had, according to a Chinese admission, an aptitude for literature. When they were masters of Khotan, they were installed in the greatest centre of Buddhism, which with its innumerable establishments for monks and nuns including some that were Chinese, dominated the social and intellectual life of the people. From Pei-ting (in the eastern Tian-shan), upon its capture in 791 A.D., they brought away the treasure of the shrines, including images or impersonations of two figures in the local Buddhist pantheon, namely the magician Pe-kar and Bse-bag, a rather indefinite figure ; also the story of Ge-sar. They may have seen in Kucā a sanctuary called 'The Thousand Buddhas.' But it was at Tun-huang, or Śa-cu, in western Kan-su, which had long been a great centre of Chinese Buddhist studies and where, for instance, Dharmarakṣa, the great translator, had worked during the latter half of the 3rd century A.D., that they settled down to their task. The very numerous notes, business documents and literary texts inscribed on the verses of finely written Chinese MSS., and the crudeness of the material, paper, etc., which, at any rate at first, they were able to command, illustrate their original situation there. Afterwards, as we know from actual records, there was in the monasteries there regular organization for supply of paper and ink and of copyists. The towns, Kva-cu and Śa-cu, came to have libraries of books ordered from the monasteries, which occasionally were commissioned to inspect them. Mass production is seen in the hundreds of copies of some favourite texts, *Amitāyur-dhyāna-sūtra*, *Prajñā-pāramitā-hṛdaya*, *Vajra-cchedikā*, recovered from the hidden library of Ch'ien-fo-tung. Benevolence towards Buddhism on the part of Tibetan administrators in the province is illustrated by a document containing a series of letters of introduction furnished to a monk of the shrine of Wu-t'ai-shan, in Chinese Shen-si, who was commencing a pilgrimage to Buddha-Gayā.

With a view to reforming the rude customs and moral of the people, Sroṅ-btsan Sgam-po is said to have drawn up a code of laws, sanctioned by severe penalties, mutilation of the body and so forrth. In this connection he is reported to have come into contact with Buddhist monks from Khotan, who brought to his knowledge the mild principles of their faith and the name of Amitābha. It is indeed not incredible that the overthrow of the Tu-yuk-hun kingdom, opening the way to Chinese Turkestan, should already have made the Tibetans aware of the existence of some of the states in that region ; but the story is, no doubt, apocryphal. Sorṅ-btsan Sgam-po is, however, said to have built two monasteries at Lha-sa, whereof one, Ra-mo-che, still exists, while *H*phrul-snaṅ was burned by the Chinese within a century.

Before the next great event in the history of Tibetan Buddhism, namely the arrival of Śāntirakṣita and Padmasaṃbhava, some progress in the propagation of the religion seems to have been accomplished. Some monasteries are said to have been built : translations were made of the *Karma-śataka* and the *Suvarṇa-prabhāsa-sūtra*, also of works on medicine and astronomy, possibly the germs of the huge *Vaiḍūrya-sṅon-po* and *°dkar-po*, 'The Beryl Blue' and 'Beryl White,' which are in later times the great authorities on these subjects. But the main pre-occupation of the Tibetans from the time of Sroṅ-btsan Sgam-po's death in 650 A.D., until the accession of Khri-sroṅ Lde-btsan in 755 A.D., and indeed almost until the close of the latter's reign in *c.* 798 A.D., was the great struggle with China, mainly for control of the Western countries. Probably Ladak in the West, as well as Žaṅ-Žuṅ, had been acquired in the time of Sroṅ-btsan Sgam-po, who had conquered the Tang-hsiang tribe on his east and inflicted a defeat upon the Tu-yuk-hun kingdom to the north. But the most martial reign was that of his grandson and successor, Maṅ-sroṅ Maṅ-btsan, under whose great commanding barons, especially, until 699 A.D., those of the Mgar family, the Tibetans came to dominate Nepal on the south, while in the north they annihilated the Tu-yuk-hun state and made several expeditions to Chinese Turkestan, which during the years 670-694 A.D. was under their control. In 727 A.D. they definitely took over the country of Shan-shan and became a counterpoise to the Chinese at their headquarters in Kucā. In 737-740 A.D. they conquered Baltistan on the west and established relations with as many as 20 states in the Pāmīr countries. The famous Chinese expedition of 747 A.D. was a temporary check in that region; but by about 760 A.D. the Chinese hold on Turkestan was limited to Kucā and Pei-t'ing (Turfan-Guchen area), which in the years 789-791 the Tibetans finally wrested from them and from their Uigur allies. Subsequently they may even have made raids into Turkish territory as far as the Altai mountains. In the latter half of the eighth century they took possession of Khotan and dominated it from their fort on the Mazār-Tāgh hill, about 100 miles lower down on the river: previously, no doubt, they had built the fort of Endere, between Cer-cen and the Niya river.

The bitterest struggle, however, had been waged, though with several attempts at pacification, in the western and southern regions of Kan-su, which passed progressively under Tibetan domination, until, in 763 A.D., the Tibetans even entered the Chinese capital, Changan or Si-ngan-fu. A stable peace, commemorated on the celebrated pillar, *rdo-riṅ*, in Lha-sa, was ultimately attained in 822 A.D. About 850 A.D. the Uigurs established themselves in Western Kan-su (Tun-huang-Śa-cu) and also in the Turfan-Pei-t‘ing region. Retaining Shan-shan, the Tibetans continued to be the natural enemy both of the Uigurs on the north and of Khotan, which perhaps had been simultaneously lost to them ; until, in the year 1035 A.D., the rise of the Tangut kingdom interposed between them and Chinese Turkestan a barrier, which was removed only by Cingīz Khan's overthrow of that kingdom in 1226 A.D. During the whole Mongol period Tibet was under the domination of that power, and then of its heirs, the Manchu and later dynasties in China. But since the first adoption of Buddhism by Kublai Khan and the institution, in *c.* 1261 A.D., of an abbot of the Śākya monastery as its pontiff, the spiritual relation has been the reverse of that : the largest body of pilgrims to the Koko-nor region,—which in nomenclature is still mainly Mongol and which neither the Chinese nor the Tibetans themselves recognize as belonging to Tibet—and, moreover, of pilgrims to Lha-sa also, are Mongolians : formerly there were also bodies of Kalmaks from the Volga.

During the long reign (705-755 A.D.) of Khri-lde Gtsug-brtan Mes-'ag-tshoms occurred the arrival of the refugee monks from Khotan and other, more westerly, countries. At the instance of the queen, namely the Chinese princess Kim-śeṅ (Chin-chêng) Koṅ-co, they were welcomed and established for some time (12 years ?) in Tibet. A plague, whereof the queen (741 A.D.) and many nobles and common people died, created a superstitious prejudice against them, and they were expelled westwards : being joined, it is stated, by monks from China, victims of Taoist persecution. The next event in Tibet, occasioned, it is said, by troubles due to malignant demons, was an invitation to a learned Buddhist saint and philosopher, Śāntirakṣita, resident in Nepal, afterwards known in Tibet as Bodhisattva, to visit Lha-sa : the letter of invitation is preserved in the Tibetan Canon (*Bstan-ḥgyur*). Not finding himself fitted for the task of subduing Tibetan demons, Śāntirakṣita, while in Lha-sa, proposed application to an already famous exorcist of U-rgyan, or Udyāna, a country of ancient Buddhist faith, but associated by the Chinese (Hiuen-Tsang and the *T'ang-shu*) with magic arts. In Hiuen-Tsang's time the country was Mahāyānist. Padmasaṃbhava, whose biography attributes to him a miraculous lotus-birth and who in popular Lamaism is a divinity on a level with the Buddhas, had travelled widely in the western Himālayan countries and also in India (Vajrāsana, Bengal, Assam, etc.), not to mention his perhaps fabulous visits to Khotan and the famous Wu-t'ai-shan shrine of Mañjuśrī in Chinese Shen-si. He had been reared as son of the Udyāna king : his métier was that of a cemetery-haunting Yogin and demon-queller ; and he thus acquired influence with rulers of the rude states, generally involving them in domestic complications : it was in this manner that he secured his wife Mandārava, of famous name, daughter of the ruler of Zahor (Mande). Accepting the Tibetan invitation, he arrived in Lha-sa in about 780 A.D. The thirteen years of his stay in Lha-sa after quelling the demons laid the foundations of Lamaism. In co-operation with the king and his successor, Mu-tig Btsan-po, the great shrine of Bsam-yas was built : for the first time native Tibetans were ordained ; innumerable Sanskrit MSS. were imported, and a corps of translators organized, including many names which figure extensively in the Tibetan canon ; the law, canonical and civil, was codified and a great deposit of MSS. was made. Many incidents varied the proceedings ; a romantic history of a temptation of the most famous native translator, Vairocana, by the queen, and the queen's repentance ; a musical celebration of the opening of the shrine ; and a final recapitulation of the entire proceedings by Padmasaṃbhava himself, with predictions and exhortations, preparatory to his departure in *c.* 795 for Nepal.

The bulk, but by no means the whole, of the Sanskrit texts imported by Padmasaṃbhava and translated under his direction was Tāntric, in various classes, *Kriyā*, *Yoga*, *Anuyoga*, etc. These scriptures form a separate canon, which has rarely been inspected. They definitely established what later was known as the 'old' (*Rñiṅ-ma*) sect of Lamaism on an exclusively Indian basis: this was emphasized by a famous debate, still commemorated by the regular demon-dance celebrations in Lamasseries, wherein the then orthodox metaphysics was championed by a celebrated Indian philosopher, Kamalaśīla, of Magadha, and the part of the defeated malignant was, and is, played by the Chinese interloper, Hva-shang Mahādeva, champion of the Mahāyāna.

There had been, however, another party present in the debate and representing the real opposition. This was the party of the Bon-po, the old national religion. The Bon religion had constructed a complicated cosmological and geographical system with more than one heaven, and with Bon lords ruling severally the celestial and terrestrial regions. But essentially the Bons who counted in human life were the terrestrial ones, in their nature similar, no doubt, to the Yakṣas of ancient India and the Nats of Burma. They were powers ruling over lands, mountains, rivers, lakes and other prominent natural features: though not necessarily hostile to mankind, they could in some ways be offended, in which case they manifested the malignant side of their nature by sending storms, floods, plague, murrain and so forth, as chthonian powers are apt to do. They were prone to resent the presence of foreigners, and anything novel in the country might be obnoxious to them. In short, they furnished a permanent basis for conservative sentiments. In the protests which from time to time we read of Tibetan ministers making to the measures of reforming kings it is the voice of the Bon that we hear; and generally it makes a strong appeal to the superstitious sentiment of the folk. Since the time of Padmasambhava great changes have taken place; and now the Buddhist religion is the normal ruler of people's behaviour and belief in towns and villages everywhere: the Bon-po monasteries are thinly spread through the country ; and their books, despite their inverted Svastika and altered Maṇi-padme formula, and the part retention of the old cosmology, which in fact has somewhat infected the Buddhist notions, are hardly less emphatically philanthropic and altruistic in their professions than the Mahāyāna itself : they are however, more lavish in citing lists of demons, demonesses, and Nāgas of several obscure denominations, and in meaningless rites.

The demons and Nāgas exercised by Padmasaṃbhava were chthonian powers. During the reign of Ral-pa-can, son and successor of Mu-tig Btsan-po, the ascendancy of Buddhism was maintained : more paṇḍits and translators were invited from India, and the privileges of the clergy were enlarged. Glań-darma, the next king (*c*. 816-842 A.D.), was the famous apostate, whose assassination by a disguised monk is regularly re-enacted in the monastic plays. The religious houses were closed, the images and books buried and the monks forced back into unsanctified, lay life. The assassination, which took place in 842 A.D., confirmed the ascendancy of the Buddhist clergy, which became the dominant power in the state. What had in fact happened was that the military energy of the country had been exhausted by the long wars and by the humiliation or defection of the military barons : the peace with China eventuated in 822 A.D. Buddhism, which is unrivalled in the power of destroying the military spirit of peoples, also saps the authority of rulers, so that the later kings of Tibet were without significance.

Corruptions, however, crept into the religion. In an effort to reform them, Ye-śes-*h*od, the only notable figure among the later rulers, having his seat, however, not at Lha-sa, but at Gu-ge and Pu-hrańs in the west, made elaborate efforts to procure the inter-position of a celebrated Indian saint, Atiśa or Atīśa, known in religion as Dīpaṃkara-Śrījñāna, head of the University of Vikramaśīla, in Magadha. After the king's tragic end, and by means of very interesting negotiations, which are related in the *Life* of Atiśa with genuine human and religious sentiment, his son succeeded in bringing the saint to Tibet, where after 13 years of reforming effort in all parts of the country he died in *c.* 1053 A.D. at the age of 73. His reforms constitute the second expansion of Buddhism in Tibet: of his numerous original works and commentaries preserved in the *Bstan-ḫgyur* the best known is his *Bodhi-patha-pradīpa*, which has been edited in Sanskrit with an English translation. He belonged to the Kāla-cakra system and was founder of the *Bkaḫ-gdams-pa* sect of Lamaism.

The only other important religious movement in Tibet which was directly inspired from India was that of the Siddhas, concerning whom little is known. But from the biography of one of them, Naro-pa, edited and translated by Grünwedel, we see that they were a line of Vajrācārya saints, who were largely concerned with worship of Ḍākinīs and with atrocious self-mortifications, perhaps also with erotic ideas. One of them, Mar-pa, the translator, having returned to India, was a senior contemporary of Atiśa at Vikramaśīla: he was the very exacting teacher of the great Tibetan poet and ascetic, Mi-la-ras-pa (1038-1122 A.D.). We need not further follow the history of the Tibetan church, with its reformer Tsoṅ-kha-pa (born *c.* 1355 A.D.), its numerous sects, incarnate abbots, and Dalai Lama, who derives his original political status from recognition by the Mongol emperors.

To turn to the literature: The compilation of the two Tibetan canonical collections, the *Bkaḫ-ḫgyur*, 'translated word,' and *Bstan-ḫgyur*, 'translated doctrine,' of Buddha and the divines respectively, the Śruti and Smṛti of Tibet, is ascribed to Bu-ston, born in 1288, author of a history of the religion. The two collections are known in several editions, printed at Sṅar-thaṅ (Tashilhunpo), Potala (Lha-sa), Derge (Sde-dge) in eastern Tibet, at Co-ni and Kum-bum in the north-east and at Peking. Many parts of it were printed in Central Asia during Mongol times, as is shown by innumerable fragments, often with Chinese numeration in the folio margins, found at Karakhoto on the Etsin-gol river. There have also been many separate prints of individual works and of collectaneous selections. Under the patronage of the Mongol emperors the *Bkaḫ-ḫgyur*, but perhaps not also the *Bstan-ḫgyur*, was further translated into Mongol and Manchu, and printed in especially fine large *pothī* volumes, with artistic miniatures and painted board coverings. In Tibet particular works are sometimes printed, for luxury or ritual use, in gold or silver ink on special paper with prepared writing surfaces. The most imposing volume that I have seen, a really elephantine product, is used in the services of the chief monastery of Gyantse: it is lifted by four men. But remarkable also in their way are volumes sometimes obtained from Central Asia, with the text in five or six languages, Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese, Mongol, Manchu, and perhaps Turkī.

The material for these collections was not the work of only the groups organized by Padmasaṃbhava and Atiśa in Central Tibet, or their predecessors or successors. As we see from the colophons of the successive individual works, the translators and their paṇḍits belonged to all parts of Tibet, many of them coming from the north-eastern districts. We have therefore in the two canons a totalization of the work which had been going on for centuries in the monasteries, demonstrably linking on with the copyist activity which we have witnessed in the monastic communities of Tun-huang. A recovered MS. document gives us, in fact, succession lists of heads of seminaries in Lha-sa, Mdo-gams, Go-cu and Si-gon-bu, the two last being perhaps Chinese Ho-chow and Si-ngan-fu. Certainly not all was included: for from the hidden library at Tun-huang we have large numbers of previously unknown translations of *Sūtras*, *Tantras*, commentaries and other works, as well as original narratives, catechisms, dogmatic expositions and miscellanea. The actual arrangement of the texts in the *Bkaḫ-ḫgyur* is systematic, but may repay some further study in comparison with the Chinese *Tripiṭaka*. It is known that the two canons contain some works translated from the Chinese, or even from unknown languages, the Bru-'za and that of Khotan.

From the first the Tibetan translators have refused to confine their interest to Buddhist literature. Even from Tun-huang we have some copies of a short version of the *Rāmāyaṇa* story, comparable to popular versions such as we find in the *Mahā-Bhārata*. In the *Bstan-ḥgyur* itself we have a considerable number of Sanskrit *Śāstra* works; grammar represented by the systems of Pāṇini, Candra, Kalāpa, and the Sārasvata grammar; lexicography by the *Amara-kośa*, etc. ; Kāvya by the *Megha-dūta*; Alaṃkāra by Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa*, often printed separately· metre by a *Chando-ratnākara* and *Vṛtta-mālā*; medicine represented by the *Astāñga-hṛdaya* of Vāgbhaṭa and several other works; painting by a *Pratimā-lakṣaṇa* ; *nīti* by a *Cāṇakya-nīti* and other works ; and so forth. The *Bstan-ḥgyur* also presents two works in the original Sanskrit, an *Īśvara-nirākaraṇa*, 'Refutation of Theism', by Nāgārjuna, and a *Sarasvatī-stotra*, attributed to Kālidāsa.

The Tibetans do not know Sanskrit, and perhaps few of them ever did know it. But by their singular fidelity in quite literal translation, a fidelity which must have rendered the versions in so different a language hardly intelligible, they have preserved a serviceable equivalent for masses of Buddhist Sanskrit literature otherwise irrecoverable. There have been, as is well known, many fairly successful attempts to restore Sanskrit texts, even poems, from the Tibetan; and in particular passages a Tibetan version is for critical purposes as good as an old MS. In this way, not to speak of the propagation of a knowledge of Sanskrit literature over the whole great area influenced by the Lamaist scriptures, they have rendered an incomparable service to Indian literature and thought. It is even possible to overrate the unintelligibility of the versions of Sanskrit *kāvyas* : a reader would, indeed, be frequently led astray if he attempted the *Megha-dūta* without the original ; but with skill and practice he could make his way with fair security through the *Buddha-carita* of Aśvaghoṣa.

Original literature in Tibetan is rather abundant. There are church histories; biographical and critical collectanea (*Gsuṅ-ḫbum*) of successive Dalai Lamas and other great Lamas; biographies and biographical poems, such as those relating to Padmasaṃbhava and Atiśa; the two great thesauruses of medicine and astronomy; stories, such as the famous Ge-sar story; works of ritual; sayings and proverbs; folk-tales and poems. A portion of this also is obviously of ultimate Indian and Buddhist inspiration, both in matter and in form. But naturally China also has a share.

some works translated from the Chinese, or even from unknown languages, the Bru-ˋza and that of Khotan.

From the first the Tibetan translators have refused to confine their interest to Buddhist literature. Even from Tun-huang we have some copies of a short version of the *Rāmāyaṇa* story, comparable to popular versions such as we find in the *Mahā-Bhārata*. In the *Bstan-ẖgyur* itself we have a considerable number of Sanskrit *Śāstra* works; grammar represented by the systems of Pāṇini, Candra, Kalāpa, and the Sārasvata grammar; lexicography by the *Amara-kośa*, etc. ; Kāvya by the *Megha-dūta*; Alaṃkāra by Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa*, often printed separately· metre by a *Chando-ratnākara* and *Vṛtta-mālā*; medicine represented by the *Aṣṭāṅga-hṛdaya* of Vāgbhaṭa and several other works; painting by a *Pratimā-lakṣaṇa* ; *nīti* by a *Cāṇakya-nīti* and other works ; and so forth. The *Bstan-ẖgyur* also presents two works in the original Sanskrit, an *Īśvara-nirākaraṇa*, 'Refutation of Theism', by Nāgārjuna, and a *Sarasvatī-stotra*, attributed to Kālidāsa.

The Tibetans do not know Sanskrit, and perhaps few of them ever did know it. But by their singular fidelity in quite literal translation, a fidelity which must have rendered the versions in so different a language hardly intelligible, they have preserved a serviceable equivalent for masses of Buddhist Sanskrit literature otherwise irrecoverable. There have been, as is well known, many fairly successful attempts to restore Sanskrit texts, even poems, from the Tibetan; and in particular passages a Tibetan version is for critical purposes as good as an old MS. In this way, not to speak of the propagation of a knowledge of Sanskrit literature over the whole great area influenced by the Lamaist scriptures, they have rendered an incomparable service to Indian literature and thought. It is even possible to overrate the unintelligibility of the versions of Sanskrit *kāvyas* : a reader would, indeed, be frequently led astray if he attempted the *Megha-dūta* without the original ; but with skill and practice he could make his way with fair security through the *Buddha-carita* of Aśvaghoṣa.

Original literature in Tibetan is rather abundant. There are church histories; biographical and critical collectanea (*Gsuṅ-ḥbum*) of successive Dalai Lamas and other great Lamas; biographies and biographical poems, such as those relating to Padmasaṃbhava and Atiśa; the two great thesauruses of medicine and astronomy; stories, such as the famous Ge-sar story; works of ritual; sayings and proverbs; folk-tales and poems. A portion of this also is obviously of ultimate Indian and Buddhist inspiration, both in matter and in form. But naturally China also has a share.

VII.: GREATER INDIA : 3. CHINA

It is, I hope, self-evident that in venturing to approach the subject of Indianism in China I must definitely renounce the pretence, hitherto maintained, of a survey and offer little more than a distant perspective or even a few items of gossip. The study of Chinese literature and history, while covering an enormous area of space and time, is notoriously also one in which painful misunderstandings and errors await all who meddle in it unprepared by information both exact and wide and by the most careful scholarship. The inborn philological instinct of the Chinese, fortified by millenniums of scholarly experience, has made them familiar long ago with questions of authenticity and reading, with distinctions of earlier and later forms of writing, and with the use of epigraphical and numismatic evidence.

The Chinese seem to have developed early, and to have perpetuated, a schematistic view of the Universe. The cosmos is an ordered unity, governed by the eternal Tao, the way or truth, which rules the movements of the heavens, *t'ien*, the latter conceivable as a benevolent parent. Representative on earth of this providential principle is the Emperor, the Son of Heaven, whose relation to his subjects in similarly paternal. In the nature of things there can be only one Imperial Father on the terrestrial plane, just as there is only one order ruling the heavens. Hence all foreign peoples can be accommodated, in their proper places, in the Chinese imperial scheme; but none can be regarded as equal or rival.

The orderliness of things is conceived by the Chinese not mystically, as a deep underlying principle, but extensively, as something open to candid observation. It is a doctrine of how things behave, and in its application to society it seems to have a more or less behaviouristic tendency. The main matter is that of conduct, how we ought to conduct ourself in our dealings with our fellow men. Especially in regard to the Emperor, the general father, and to one's own parents, is right behaviour all important ; but evidently the principle can be applied also to dealings with all other human beings and even to animals and to inanimate objects.

Various stories illustrate this conception of decent behaviour as a principle ; as when a teacher, finding an opportunity of despatching a letter to his father, calls up a boy and orders him to indite a letter from a son to a father. It is eminently serviceable in the political sphere, facilitating the enunciation of suave formulae, the pacification of discontented potentates by means of carefully measured expressions of esteem or tokens of honour, preoccupying them with questions of status and procedure, and sometimes, as in the case of an unfortunate Hiung-nu king, degrading them by alterations in style of address or of a seal.

We must not fail to note that, even taken by itself, this behaviouristic conception has ethico-philosophical value. It requires people to act not in obedience to individual likings, but upon principles which are public. It is a doctrine of duty, differing from the *dharma* inculcated in the *Bhagavad-Gītā* by being broadly human instead of applying to innumerable special obligations of unexamined, merely traditional, validity. But a purely formalistic notion of duty would never have furnished the vigour necessary for the practical realization of the Chinese scheme of things. The self-surrender which it implies is the ethical germ : when inwardness is given to it, as in the Confucian preaching, it carries with it the notion of sincerity and avoidance of what we cannot openly confess to, such as things indecorous, petty and mean. Likewise, it fosters, if not the practicality of the naturally practical man, at least a certain robust common sense, such as occasionally appears in frank denunciations of subtleties or incongruities in the views of more refined, *e.g.*, Buddhist thinkers. Even in quite abstract matters this straightforward tackling of problems may make a notable point, as in the case of the ancient Chinese philosopher who argued that, if there are two cows in a field, there are three things therein.

It is commonly agreed that some such Confucian scheme is deeply ingrained in the Chinese mentality, and that its contradiction is seen in the mysticism of Lao-tse. The superstitious side of Confucianism would be seen in divination, that of Lao-tse in non-rationalistic magic.

In contrast to all this, the Indian tendency is critical and analytic. It does not allow to common notions an unquestioned validity. It examines the bases of natural emotions and sentiments, tracing them back to some ultimate attachment, due to an error or an ignorance: at the base of all attraction and action it finds a self-principle (*ahaṃ-kāra*), which is an extraneous limit imposed upon the spirit. It realizes that human motives and sentiments are conditioned by a past and that there may be no final sincerity even in the most self-deceptive professions: as in the *Mahā-Bhārata* story of the dead child and the competing appeals of the vulture and the jackal, urging them to leave it, or not to leave it, before nightfall. We need not be meant to understand that the two predatory creatures were conscious of their actual motives. The author seems to wish to leave that question in a state of doubt; and perhaps the habit of narrating a story within a story expresses really a sceptical disclaimer of responsibility as to what is the final truth of any matter. The fondness also for *Śleṣa* and double meanings may imply a feeling that matters have many aspects, when we penetrate further and further into them.

A particular faculty, markedly present in the Indian and lacking in the Chinese, is that of linguistic analysis. Here the Chinese seem to have been hopelessly incapacitated by the character of their language. Having practically no distinctions of classes of words, such as nouns, verbs, adverbs, or adjectives, since most of their monosyllabic vocables can be employed in various functions, determined by the general meaning and by order in the sentence, and having no modifications of form such as cases, tenses, moods, etc., they take a synthetic, and not an analytic, view of the sentence. The words, again, often with widely variant senses differentiated only by a tone, which is an unanalysable factor, present themselves necessarily as indivisible wholes. It is stated that even now the Chinese are unable to grasp any division of one of their monosyllables further than into a beginning and an end: even this they learnt from the Hindus in the third and the sixth century A.D. The help of the Hindus are noted in Chinese Buddhist books, which speak of the 'foreign writing of the western countries' and 'Brahmanical writing.' The Hindus constructed for them a system of 36 initials, which they described phonetically. The system was in use during several centuries, and is, according to Edkins, not the least of the services rendered by the Hindus to the sons of Han. 'Never, perhaps, since the days of Cadmus,' says Edkins[1], 'was a philological impulse more successful than that thus communicated from India to the Chinese, if the extent of its adoption be the criterion. They have not only, by the use of the syllabic spelling thus taught to them, collected the materials for philological research afforded by the modern dialects, but by patient industry have discovered the early history of the language, showing how the number of tones increased from two to three by the time of Confucius, to four in the sixth century of our era, and soon to their present state'...' the Chinese, by patience and a true scientific instinct, have placed the materials in such a form that little labour is needed to gather from them the facts that they contain.' Here we see the historico-philological gift of the Chinese. But they might have done much better to accept as a whole, like the peoples of Central Asia, the Tibetans and perhaps also the Coreans, a system put forward on Indian lines, which, in fact, would have facilitated their use of *Dhāraṇīs*, to which they became attached. The feasibility and great advantage of this has been seen in the case of Chinese texts actually written at Tun-huang in Brāhmī and Tibetan characters.

---

[1] *Chinese Buddhism*, Ed. 2, p. 114.

Another sphere in which the influence of Indian systems is seen in China is that of astronomy, astrology and mathematics. In the Chinese astronomy Sumeru, Rāhu and Ketu appear as in the Indian, also diagrammatic illustrations, which are said not to have been used by the Chinese in early times. It seems that some of these things have worked down into the popular consciousness. Among minor items of Indian influences, conveyed, no doubt, through Buddhism, we may cite the statements that there is a popular belief in Buddhist prayer, that Buddhist priests are often present at funeral ceremonies, that there is a wide-spread belief in a Western Heaven : I am told that in the streets of Peking are to be seen little shrines of Indra and Yama. Buddhist festivals are recognized in official calendars.

To what extent Buddhist conceptions have really penetrated into the general mentality of the Chinese people appears to be a psychological mystery, which can be solved only by the direct experience of persons profoundly acquainted with the literature and discriminately observant. It would seem that something is commonly known concerning Buddhist notions ; which could hardly help being the case among a people who during nearly two thousand years have had Buddhism in their midst, who have at times seen it powerfully stimulated by imperial preference, have seen it persecuted, but never absolutely uncountenanced by one member or another of their successive dynasties ; who have under their ken or within their knowledge the existence of Buddhist temples in the cities, including Peking, of clusters of shrines at famous sites, and of millions of Buddhists in the general population. Buddhism has also been a familiar object of criticism on the part of the orthodox and lies under the disapproval of the literati. We do not gather, however, that it has in any way affected the literary psychology or style of the Chinese. The style of Buddhist writings appears to be regarded as something rather simple, not competing with the mythological and historical allusiveness of real Chinese: the difference may be appreciated by any one who compares, in the English translation, the preface to Hiuen-Tsang's *Si-yu-ki* with the main text. Thus the general impression which we receive from our reading concerning China, and likewise from the outlook of Sinologists, is that the Chinese view of things, of which the main outlines were laid down long prior to any contact with the world of India, has not been seriously affected thereby.

It is remarkable how little India and China have met, so to speak, on the field of history or commerce. As a political factor, the existence of China would doubtless be present to the mind of Hiuen-Tsang's royal host, Bhāskaravarman, in Kāmarūpa (Assam), since he must have been aware of so great, however inaccessible, a neighbour. The emperor Harṣa, in the philanthropic attentions which with such unparallelled splendour he lavished upon the pilgrim, may have been not innocent of the idea of indirectly impressing the rulers of China; and this may have been somewhat in view of the portent which had appeared in the west, namely the sudden rise of Islam and destruction of the Sassanian kingdom. At least we are told that in private interviews he made particular enquiries concerning China and its emperor, to whom he had already, it seems, sent a mission. The only historical occasion when Chinese military forces appeared on the soil of India was in connection with the troubles which followed upon the death of Harṣa: and even then the successful campaign of Wang Hiuen-ts'e, who carried off the usurper Arjuna to China, was effected by the aid of Nepalese, and also, preponderatingly we should suppose, Tibetan, troops. China proper was never invaded by any body of Indian soldiers: apart from missionaries and traders we seem to hear only of occasional communications from Indian kings. The cases of Kashmir and Arachosian rulers receiving brevets from the Chinese Court are not very much in point: but in 795 A.D.

a king Subhakara of Orissa sent, by the hand of a monk Prajña, of Ki-pin, a letter and an autograph of a Buddhist work, the *Gaṇḍa-vyūha*: in 602 A.D. five Indian kings are reported as present in person at the Chinese Court. The two great countries, India and China, appear to have had not much need of each others' products: some scholars doubt whether even the trading vessels which, as early as Roman times, landed and loaded up goods on the Coromandel coast, will have been in a strict sense Chinese. On the whole, except as concerns missionaries and pilgrims, the interaction of the two great peoples has been mainly through third parties, Hūnas, Turks, Mongols and so forth.

Not to confine ourselves to trifling with our real subject, which is, of course, the history of Buddhism and Buddhist literature in China, we should point out that the matter is complicated by the fact that for entrance of Buddhist influences China presented two openings, one of them north-western, which in regard to time and place we have already come to know somewhat, the other in the south, leading from the Indo-Chinese peninsula and the Malay countries and connected with the spread of Indian civilization in those parts. From the latter region communications, chiefly by sea and entering at Canton, are familiar to Indologists from the record of Fa-hian's journey from the Ganges to China, *via* Java, in about 410 A.D., bringing Indian books and religious wares. But they are also illustrated by some letters from rulers of states in Java or Sumatra, conveying respectful greetings to the Imperial court and giving descriptions of their countries' situation, religion, and so forth. Of these letters, preserved in the Chinese official histories, some specimens are translated in the volume of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1933; these are from a king Pishabarma of Aratan and are dated 433 and 436 A.D. There is also a letter from a king of 'Kapila,' A.D. 428: others are of later date. It was by the southern route, probably, that most of the Indian teachers brought Buddhist literature and doctrines to China. That at any rate was the route followed by Bodhidharma, who left southern India in 526 A.D. He was a great supporter and practitioner of the principles of the *Dhyāna* school : he died in China. Paramārtha of Ujjain also arrived, in 546 A.D., by sea. In far earlier times there had been in China some knowledge of southward communications by also a land route or routes ; and we hear of a country named Fu-kan, which scholars propose to identify in name with Pagan. Perhaps a knowledge of the countries of Cambodia and Campā, which lay somewhat west of the main sea route, was not later than these notices, which may go back to the first or second century A.D.

The work of translating was organized for the most part under imperial patronage and on a large scale. In the north the great centres were usually the imperial capitals, Changan and Lo-yang ; but at Tun-huang, on the north-west frontier, there was, as we have seen, an activity going back to the second half of the third century A.D., when Dharmarakṣa was working there : it continued down to Mongal times. Another centre in Kan-su was Liang-chou, the *Leṃ-cu* of the Tibetan documents. The greatest centre in the south was at Nan-king. Between the North and the South there was perhaps this difference, that in the former many of the early translators were of non-Indian birth, men from Parthia, the Yueh-chi country, Samarcand, Central Asia itself, while those from the South will have brought a more purely Indian tradition. The greatest translator of the northern school, Kumārajīva, who worked in China during the years 401-412 A.D., was born of Indian parents in Kucā. To illustrate the scale of the work, we may cite the facts that by about the end of the third century A.D. 180 monasteries had been erected and there were 3,700 monks ; 13 translators had produced versions of 73 works. By about the end of the fourth century there had been constructed, during 104 years, as many as 17,068 temples, while 263 volumes had been translated by 27 translators. At later dates the numbers are far greater : the immense task of translating 740 works in 1,335 books, carried out by Hiuen-Tsang after his return to China, is well known.

At the beginning of the sixth century A.D., there are said to have been as many as 3,000 Indians in China (Edkins, *Chinese Buddhism*, p. 99). Before the end of eighth century there were Indians in Japan.

The translations were usually written with the help of Chinese amanuenses, who furnished the correct expressions. The older ones, including the work of Dharmarakṣa, are said to be poor in style and difficult to understand owing to imperfect adaptation to Chinese speech : they are also frequently somewhat paraphrastical, giving the gist, rather than an exact representation, of the full meaning. Nevertheless it seems likely that much may yet be gleaned from them concerning early uses, and early pronunciations, of Sanskrit technical terms and names in Buddhism. Hiuen-Tsang, after his experience of Indian exactness in linguistic matters, introduced many corrected spellings, which in part reflect changes in Chinese pronunciation : and this also may furnish good material for research

At an early period catalogues of Buddhist works rendered into Chinese became requisite in China. The first substantial catalogue is attributed to about the middle of the third century A.D. : it had many successors : Bunyiu Nanjio, in his Catalogue of the Chinese *Tripiṭaka*, describes as many as thirteen, some of them no longer in existence ; and Dr. Bagchi, in his *Le Canon Bouddhique en Chine*, has given particulars of others also. These catalogues are still serviceable, since they attest the dates of translations which were lost in ancient times or were not included in the *Tripiṭaka*, and so furnish a *terminus ad quem* for the date of composition of the original Sanskrit texts. But, just as in the case of the Tibetan *Bkaḫ-ḫgyur*, this is not the whole story : from the hidden library of Ch'ien-to-fung have come numbers of translations into Chinese which had never been recorded in China and which therefore had appeared in none of the editions of the *Tripiṭaka*, the great old Peking edition, published by order of the emperor T'ai-tsu (1368-98 A.D.), the Tokyo edition, the Kyoto edition, both issued in Japan, or that of Korea. Hence many new texts will be found reproduced in Dr. Yabuki's large folio volume of facsimiles, and whole volumes of the new Japanese edition, the Tai-sho edition, are constituted mainly of new texts from Tun-Huang.

Chinese Buddhism had not been a mere passive reflection of that of India. In the first place we should note the co-existence of two distinct forms of Buddhism there, the Buddhism of native tradition and Lamaism, imported from Tibet and represented by great monasteries, such as the celebrated one in Peking, headed by its own incarnate Buddha and manned by Tibetans. The real Chinese Buddhism has from early date been divided into sects. In Indian and Central-Asian Buddhism there was recognized in fairly ancient times a division of interest, represented by the institution of separate ' Schools of doctrine ' and ' Schools of *dhyāna*.' The first texts introduced into China were simple works of ethical or religious tendency, like the *Sūtra in 42 sections*, the *Karma-vibhaṅga*, *avadānas*, and the *Sukhāvatī-vyūha* : somewhat later came various *dhāraṇīs*. Kumārajīva appears to have been the first to translate Mahāyāna works, the difficult dialectical treatises of Nāgārjuna, Āryadeva, Vasubandhu and others: Dignāga came in due course later. The *Āgamas* and *Vinaya*,—and it is, of course, known that the Chinese *Tripiṭaka* contains the *Āgamas* and *Vinaya* of several sects, including the Pāli—were almost contemporary with the Mahāyāna, of which at a later date Hiuen-Tsang was, as is well known, a very emphatic champion. In China these preferences developed into sects, the ' Pure Land ' sect, the ' Lotus Sect,' the *Dhyāna* or *Chan* Sect and so forth, and created a literature of original Chinese commentaries, some of them of great value. The tendency to choose one Buddhist canonical work for primacy of authority in a particular sect has prevailed, and has even been accentuated, in Japan, which, originally dependent, almost exclusively upon

China for its Buddhism, has in later centuries gone its own way in the development of the faith, creating even in fairly modern times new schemata of dogma and practice. At the present time the Japanese Buddhism is in propaganda the real protagonist of the faith, while in the study of the ancient Indian originals no other country has produced scholars combining to the same extent a facility in dealing with the sources and a painstaking scholarly method. It is to Japanese scholars also that we owe the publication of the two texts of non-Buddhist Indian philosophy contained in the *Tripiṭaka*, namely the *Sāṃkhya-Kārikā* of Īśvara-Kṛṣṇa, with a full original commentary, translated by Professor Takakusu, and the Vaiśeṣika *Daśa-padārthī*, translated with a valuable historical Introduction by Professor Ui.

VIII : Greater India : 4. Further India and Malaysia

In order to complete the circle of literary influences radiated from India in comparatively early times it is necessary to cast at least a glance at Further India and the Malay Islands. In regard to parts of this region we have now a certain abundance of evidence, varying, however, in kind. As to Further India, the main difficulty consists in the absence of information concerning the areas now covered by the Pāli-Buddhism of Burma and Siam. The immigration of the present Burmese and Siamese peoples took place perhaps not earlier than the eleventh and fourteenth century respectively. Seeing that the people of Pegu, to the west of the valley of the Irrawady, are linguistically of Mon-Khmer descent and that the old kingdom of Cambodia, which lies to the east of Siam and which at one time included in its dominion some part, or the whole, of that country, is likewise Mon-Khmer, it is natural to suppose that an originally continuous area of Mon-Khmer race and speech has been parted into two by a wedge of Tibeto-Burman and Thai people. Accordingly the Burmese and Siamese are unable to supply information relating to the early history of their present territories ; and perhaps they have co-operated with the natural forces in obliterating any traces which otherwise might have survived. We have no ancient literature relating to those countries, and unfortunately no old buildings or coins : the only inscriptions which can be ascribed to a date as early as the 6th century A.D. are some short passages in Pāli and Pyū. To the 7th century belong some Sanskrit records of apparently Sarvāsti-vādin Buddhism.

There are indeed some slight indications, in the form of names, suggesting that even in pre-Buddhist times colonies of Kṣatriyas may have reached by a land route through Assam places on the upper waters of the Irrawady and Mekong rivers. In Buddhist times the idea of a journey to Suvarṇa-bhūmi seems to have been conceivable, since among the missionaries sent out by Aśoka two (Soṇa and Uttara) are stated to have been destined for the country so named. We should therefore reckon with the probability that Buddhism reached Burma in a pre-Sanskrit form, and that the importation of the Pāli-Buddhism from Ceylon in the eleventh-twelfth century A.D. was a re-enforcement from a kindred source. We do not seem to find early traces of the Mahāyāna in Burma. If therefore the ancient Chinese references to a kingdom Fu-kan, more or less in that region, really refer to the kingdom of Pagan, it may be that that was already a country of Hīnayāna Buddhism. In the 12th and 13th centuries Fu-kan was, according to Chau-ju-kua, 'devoutly Buddhist.'

The two kingdoms of Campā and Cambodia, the former occupying the eastern coast (excepting the Malay Peninsula) of Further India, for the most part a narrow strip much cut up by short river valleys descending from the mountain ridge, the latter west and south of the same mountains and comprizing the whole valley of the Mekong, have yielded to the researches of the École Françaisé d'Extrême-Orient results of great abundance, distinguished in the highest degree by scholarly method and precision. These results may be classified as (1) archaeological, comprizing discovery, inventory and description of the surviving monuments ; (2) epigraphical, including publication and interpretation of very numerous inscriptions in Sanskrit, Cam, and Khmer ; (3) historical, including the eliciting of all dynastic and historical information furnished by the inscriptions, together with all notices contained in the extraneous sources, such as Chinese histories and descriptive memoirs ; (*d*) religious and social history, deduced from the same or similar sources ; and (*e*) linguistic, grammars, dictionaries, and philology of the languages. It will be observed that neither of the two countries furnishes ancient Sanskrit texts or literature, except in so far as the inscriptions in ornate Sanskrit prose and verse may be considered to be of that nature: also any chronicles existing in the native languages are of too late a date to have historical value.

When we turn to the Java-Sumatra region, we again profit by the work of an organized body of highly qualified investigators. In this case it is to the Batavian Academy of Sciences, in co-operation with other institutions and correspondents in Holland itself, that we are mainly indebted; the work may be said to have commenced with the foundation of the Batavian Academy in 1767 A.D., and it has been prosecuted without interval, being quite similar in character to that of the French in Further India. In one respect it has had a very much greater task: for Java has several literatures of great extent, with distinctions of periods and presenting complicated problems in relation to Sanskrit and other Indian models; moreover, there are other literatures, such as the Malay, having partly different connections.

In the present sketch I have been able to consult three valuable works, which have made use of the materials so secured, *viz.*—

(1) *Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East*: Vol. I, *Champā*, Vol. II, *Suvarṇa-dvīpa*. By R. C. Majumdar (1927 and 937-38).

(2) *Indian Cultural Influence in Cambodia*. By Bijan Raj Chatterji (1928).

(3) *Indian Influences on the Literature of Java and Bali*. By Himansu Bhushan Sarkar (1934).

The unfortunate obscurity in regard to the early history of Burma infects also the other historical kingdoms. If it is true, as alleged, that at an early date Burma gives evidence of a Buddhism of a Mahāyāna kind, mixed with Śaivism, that might help to explain analogous later developments in Campā and Cambodia. But it is hard to believe that such a mixture existed as early as 500 A.D. Consequently it seems advisable to leave Burma out of account, recording only two observations: (1) if in Upper Burma there were early Indian settlers from Assam, it is unlikely that they were Buddhists at all, since even in the time of Hiuen-Tsang Buddhism had not secured an entrance into Assam ; (2) if in Lower Burma there were immigrants from the Orissa and Kaliṅga country, they might, if not Sarvāsti-vadīn, be, like the Buddhists of Kaliṅga in Hiuen-Tsang's time, followers of the Great Vehicle of the Sthavira school, that is, Hīnayāna Buddhists who accepted the dogmatic views of the Mahāyāna, while preserving their original *Vinaya*.

In these circumstances the only safe procedure is to proceed chronologically and commence with the state of Campā, corresponding to the modern Annam. The Cam people, who according to the Chinese notices were foreigners replacing, or ruling, a more primitive people, and who in the first century A.D. were still progressing northwards in Annam, were linguistically of Malay stock. The earliest inscription, which belongs palaeographically to the second or third century A.D., is in Sanskrit and speaks of a king named Śrī-Māra. This and the later inscriptions of *c*. 400 A.D. and the fifth century show no trace of Buddhism and are purely Śaivite. This Śaivite character predominates in Campā to the end ; but in the year 829 A.D. a joint donation is made to Jina (Buddha) and Śaṃkara, and in 875 A.D. a dedication of a Śiva-liṅga is associated with erection of an image of Buddha. A purely Buddhist inscription of 902 A.D. records a dedication to Lokanātha by a *Sthavira* Nāgapuṣpa, head of the monastery of Pramudita-Lokeśvara. Another inscription records the consecration, in 908 A.D., of a Śiva temple, Devaliṅgeśvara, and, in 911 A.D., a Buddhist monastery, Śrī-Vṛddha-Lokeśvara. Later we have in the same dynasty kings named respectively Parama-Buddhaloka and Parama-Brahmaloka. I-tsing's statement, at the end of the seventh century A.D., that the Buddhists of Campā belong to the Ārya-Saṃmiti-nikāya, along with a few Sarvāsti-vādins, is in apparent conflict with the mention of Lokeśvara, Amitābha, Vajradhātu, etc., in the inscriptions ; but it may perhaps be explained by the formula which we have stated. Viṣṇu is mentioned only occasionally.

The institutions of Campā appear to have been thoroughly Brāhmanic. The inscriptions are in the style of the contemporary Indian records, and their references to the *Mahā-Bhārata*, *Rāmāyaṇa*, and the grammatical and other sciences, to Purāṇic stories and so forth, are on the lines of the Indian ones; a peculiarity is seen in the use of apotheosis names of kings, Buddhaloka, Brahmaloka and so forth. One king is named Parama-Bodhisattva.

At the end of the 12th century A.D. Campā was conquered by Cambodia.

The early history of the kingdom of Cambodia is complicated by the question of the country Fu-nan, of which a foundation account is given by two Chinese ambassadors who visited it about the middle of the third century A.D. The legend mentions a man named Huen-t'ien, of a country called Ki, who married a Nāgī of Fu-nan and became the progenitor of its kings. Fu-nan appears to have covered a wider area than Cambodia, which is affirmed to have been originally a vassal state of Fu-nan. The legend re-appears, with the Brahman Kauṇḍinya as the hero and the Nāgī Somā as his bride, in the account of Bhavapura, the capital of (southern) Cambodia. At one period, however, the Cambodian genealogies name as the ancestors the *Maharṣi* Kambu and the *apsaras* Merā, founders of the Solar dynasty. The state of Fu-nan appears to have been established not later than the first century A.D. Probably in the second century A.D. it acquired a great extension, including a large part of the Malay peninsula. Its kings have in the Chinese account the surname Fan, which probably corresponds to the Sanskrit Varman; and according to reports belonging to the period 245-50 A.D. it was in direct connection with the rulers of northern India. Its script was similar to the (Brāhmī) script which the Chinese knew in Central Asia. Towards the close of the fifth century A.D. the religion seems to have been mainly Saivite; but early in the sixth century two Buddhist monks of Fu-nan, Saṃghapāla, or Saṃghavarman, and Mandrasena, arrived in China and were employed in translating scriptures. About the end of the sixth century A.D. Fu-nan was subdued by its former vassal, Cambodia. The earliest Cambodian inscriptions, probably belonging to the end of the sixth and beginning of the seventh century A. D., bear marked resemblance to a Calukya inscription of 578 A.D., and to the Javanese inscriptions of Pūrṇavarman, *c.* 400 A. D. The first of them are Śaivite and make references to Brāhmanical scriptures, *Vedas*, *Mahā-Bhārata*, *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Purāṇas*, and speak of intermarriage between a Kṣatriya princess and a Brāhman. Mention is made of Hari-Hara and even of a Viṣṇu-Caṇḍeśvareśāna-liṅga, testifying to an early tendency to amalgamate the two great Hindu gods. The first mention of Buddhists occurs in an inscription of 664 A.D.; but we have a somewhat earlier Chinese statement [1] that there are many who follow the law of the Buddha and many others who follow 'the law of the Tao', which latter is said to mean the Brāhmanic religion. It seems that in the second half of the eighth century A.D. both Campā and Cambodia suffered from attacks of Malays and Javanese, and that, in fact, Cambodia was conquered by a Śailendra king of Śrī-Vijaya, in central Sumatra. Early in the ninth century the Śiva cult begins to have a Tāntric tinge, and the worship of the Deva-rāja, the god incarnate in the king, commences. At the same period appears the worship of the Buddhist divinity Lokanātha, or Lokeśvara, and Buddhist figures become common in the architecture. Towards the end of the ninth century we have towers in a temple consecrated to deified ancestors and ancestresses. Afterwards the deceased kings regularly receive titles, such as Indravarmeśvara, identifying them with Śiva. During the time of Yaśovarman, a Cambodian conqueror of Campā (*c.* 900 A.D.), there appears for a period a new alphabet, of north Indian origin, which is found also in south India and

---

[1] The letter (484 A D.) from king Jayavarman to the Chinese court shows, that, though Saivism was general, the Buddhist Mahāyāna, with *pāramitās*, etc., was known.

Java, and in the latter is used for writing a Mahāyāna inscription of 778 A. D. In Cambodia it is associated for the most part with Śaivite regulations of a definitely Brāhmanic character and with references to Sanskrit literature. An inscription of about the middle of the tenth century is decidedly Buddhist, mentioning Lokeśvara, Vajrapāṇi, etc.; while another pays homage to Prajñā-pāramitā. Somewhat later we find mention of the *Tri-kāya* and the *Madhya-vibhāga-Śāstra* and *Tattva-saṃgraha*, and so of the full Mahāyāna. A king Sūryavarman, of *c.* 1000 A.D., addresses a salutation to Buddha as the omniscient. He issues regulations for the monasteries, and his posthumous name is Nirvāṇapāda. Nevertheless he founded temples in honour of Śiva and Viṣṇu, and had paṇḍits named Yogīśvara and Kavīśvara. The tendency to syncretism culminated in an inclusion (1067 A.D.) of Buddha in a *tri-mūrti* along with Brahmā and Viṣṇu, the whole, together with a *liṅga*, being dedicated to Śiva. By the end of the twelfth century Cambodia was in friendly relations with Ceylon ; and at the end of the thirteenth it seems to have already adopted the Hīnayāna doctrine of Siam. According to Chau-ju-kua's account (beginning of the 12th century) "The people are devout Buddhists—the incantations of the Buddhists and Taoist priests have magical power."

It may be remarked that according to the same authority Eastern Sumatra (Palembang) was Buddhist; so, too, were, even from the 5th century A.D., parts at least of the Malay Peninsula.

In regard to Java, which must have been partly Indianized as early as the beginning of the second century A.D.,—since in 132 A.D. a king Devavarman sent an embassy to China—our first real information is contained in the well-known statement of Fa-hian (*c.* 414)—

> "In this country heretics and Brahmans flourish, but the law of Buddha is not much known"

and in the rock-inscriptions (*c.* 400) of Pūrṇavarman. In 433 and 436 A.D. a certain Pishabarma, king of Aratan, in a letter addressed to the Chinese Court, describes his state as Buddhist. Certain inscriptions of East Borneo, of the third or fourth century A.D., relate to a Brāhmanical sacrifice. The next Sanskrit inscription (732 A.D.) refers to the consecration of a *liṅga*. Later, during the ninth century A.D., there was a revival of Śaivism. In *c.* 778 A.D. an inscription records the dedication of a Buddhist temple, mentioning 'the *Vinaya* and the Mahāyāna'; and about this time commences the period of great Buddhist structures in Java. The encouragement of Buddhism is associated with the existence of a Śailendra dynasty in Śrī-vijaya, Central Sumatra, a suggestion which derives support from developments which we have already noted in Cambodia. A notable point of difference between Java and the two countries which we have already considered lies in the fact that during the eleventh century A.D. there appears to have been in one region a strengthening of Vaiṣṇavism.

The same tendency to amalgamate Buddhism with Śaivism, which was noted in Further India, appears in Java from about the eleventh century A.D., when we find the phrase *Śaiva-saugat-arṣi*.

It is impossible, for various reasons, to consider now the great distinguishing feature in the Indianism of Java, namely, the existence of the large Old Kawi literature, which appears to have begun in the tenth century A.D. The professedly religious part of this literature, which includes a *Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa*, a Śaivite *Bhuvana-kośa*, a *Kamahāyānikan*, a *Bṛhaspati-tattva*, a *Sūrya-sevana*, is partly Buddhist and partly Śaiva; and there are works concerned with *mantras*. Further, there is *nīti* literature, *Kāmandaka*, etc.; law, *Śiva-śāsana*, *Devadaṇḍa*, etc.; grammar, lexicography, medicine, cosmogony and history; many works representig the *Mahā-Bhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*; also other poems, a *Smara-dahana* on the subject of the *Kumāra-saṃbhava*, a *Kṛṣṇāyaṇa*, a *Kālayavanāntaka*, an *Agastya-parva*; legends and romances of Java and Bali; and the *Tantri* literature, similar to the *Pañca-tantra*, on which it is based. As is obvious, the bulk of this literature, depends upon the Sanskrit ; and it frequently quotes Sanskrit verses ; but the critical relations to the corresponding Sanskrit works are complicated and cover wide divergences of matter and nomenclature, which, however, in some cases, as in certain *Mahā-Bhārata* works, do not quite deprive the Javanese compositions of value in regard to the text of the originals. This sort of loose correspondence of versions to Sanskrit originals is a phenomenon not confined to the Javanese literature, and will have to be considered in a wider reference. As regards Javanese '*Vedas*,' it should be noted that at various times there has been much talk also of Tamil *Vedas*, which turn out to be merely the Śaiva *Nālāyira-pirabandam* : in the case of Bali the *Vedas*, which have been brought to light and published by M. Sylvain Lévi, are found to be merely short selections of Vedic hymns, *Upaniṣads*, etc., on the one hand and Buddhist Mahāyāna fragments on the other.

It is now time to draw a lesson from the facts which we have cursorily reviewed. The first and most important observation to be made is that in all these areas the earliest, strongest and most persistent characteristic of the Indian civilization which flourished there is its Brāhmanic character : the completeness of the assimilation of Indian modes of expression, literary styles and references, mythological and religious apparatus is highly remarkable : the literary forms of the inscriptions, from the earliest Campā records of the second or third century A.D., agree with the corresponding Indian documents, showing quite similar rhetorical tropes, *śleṣas*, and allusions and so forth. All this, together with the evidence of alphabetical, archaeological and art correspondences, proves that between these countries and India a fairly continuous series of communications, direct or indirect, was maintained. In all the cases the development of Buddhism is posterior, and the Buddhism is of a kind termed Mahāyāna, in regard to which, however, there are certain reserves which may have to be made : a full Mahāyāna stage, with *Prajñā-pāramitās* and even *Vijñāna-*

vāda references, seems to have been attained in Cambodia in the tenth century.

There are important historical questions still awaiting solution. More than once it has been suggested that there are grounds for supposing that the Mahāyānist influences reached Campā and Cambodia not from India direct, but from Java or from the Sumatran kingdom of Śrī-Vijaya, under the Śailendra dynasty; a supplementary suggestion is to the effect that the tendency to amalgamate Mahāyāna ideas with Śaivism came to Śrī-Vijaya and Java from Bengal. These are matters which involve careful investigation of affiliations of alphabets and of artistic and architectural styles; also of the history of traffic from Indian ports, both on the east (Tāmralipti, Caritra, Kudūru, etc.) and on the west (ports in Gujarāt and Malabar). In regard to the early colonization of Campā one thing seems to be rather clear: it is highly unlikely that the Campā population, of Malay affinity, received its very early Indianization either from India direct, or from the Khmer country beyond the mountains: it was constantly at war with the Khmer-Cambodian kingdom, by which it was ultimately subdued. Whence then could its Indianization have come, save from Sumatra, Java or Malaysia in general? That at an early date both Brāhmanism and Buddhism had spread beyond Sumatra and Java is attested by some short Sanskrit inscriptions found in Borneo.

In regard to Ceylon, with its continuous tradition of Pāli Buddhism, scarcely anything need be said. But we may note in the Chronicle narratives a frequent re-appearance of a Mahāyānist minority. In the general Pālī literature there has been a persistent tendency to follow Sanskrit models, a tendency well illustrated by Kumāradāsa's sixth century poem, the *Jānakī-haraṇa*, and by the *dūta*-poetry in imitation of the *Megha-dūta*. The Tamils, who constitute a third of the population of Ceylon, have, it seems, a literature hardly distinguishable from that of their kindred in India.

There is one very impressive particular matter which presents itself both in Further India and in Java ; and that is the literary predominance of the two great epics, the *Mahā-Bhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*, attested by allusions in inscriptions, by versions, by representations in art. Even in Central Asia we have found a version of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. May we not say that on the circumference of Hinduism we can read plainly, what is a partly latent truth at the centre, namely that fundamentally Indian culture *was* the *Mahā-Bhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* and that these were sufficient to constitute Indian culture?

[*Bibliographical Note* : Concerning the subjects mentioned in this Lecture reference may be made to one or two publications additional to those cited above, *viz.*, *Brahmanical Gods in Burma* and *Sanskrit Buddhism in Burma*, by Niharranjan Ray; *Le Fou-nan*, by P. Pelliot (Bulletin de l'E'cole Francaise d'Extreme Orient, Vol. III, 1903, pp. 248-303); Vol. XXI (1921) of the same Bulletin, containing a summary and review of all departments of the great work of research accomplished by the E'cole Francaise in Indo-China]

ERRATA

Page	*Line*	*For*	*Read*
2	17-18	*Omit* “ and they came.........of Gujarāt.”	
40	15-16	Early in the ninth century	In the second half of the eighth century
76	17	so forrth	so forth
,,	24	Sorṅ-btsan	Sroṅ-btsan
81	11	of Mu-tig Btsan-po,	of Sad-na-legs (804-17 A.D.),
,,	14	(*c*. 816-842 A.D.),	(*c*. 836-42 A.D.),
107	15	summsry	summary

1208B

श्रेणी ——— क्रम संख्या ———

स्थायी रूप से रक्खा जाय

श्रेणी ——— क्रम संख्या ———

जब ——— ई॰ ——— तक रक्खा जाय

पी॰ एस॰ यू॰ पी॰—१२७ प्रान्तीय (जे—१९५५ प्रान्तीय कार्ड नं॰ १७—५,००,०००